DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 879 HE 017 705

TITLE Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities. A Report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership.

INSTITUTION Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE Oct 84

NOTE 140p.; For related documents, see HE 017 703-704.

AVAILABLE FROM Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 ($18.00 nonmembers; $13.00 members).

PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Role; Board Administrator Relationship; *College Administration; *College Presidents; Educational Quality; Governance; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Power Structure; Spouses; Teacher Administrator Relationship

IDENTIFIERS Blue Ribbon Commissions; *Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leader; Search Committees; Sunshine Laws

ABSTRACT

Recommendations for improving leadership by college and university presidents are presented, based on the work of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. The Commission exchanged views and conducted over 300 interviews with current and past presidents, board members, persons who had refused presidencies, executive search consultants, and others. Suggestions are offered concerning: the need to periodically review the presidency, searching for a new president, aiding entrance to the presidency, supporting the president, conducting reviews, determining the length of term and handling the president's exit, governing multicampus relationships, guiding public authority, and conducting the presidency. Specific topics include: the relationship of president to academic affairs; setting the terms for the role of the president's spouse; support for the president by the board of trustees and by faculty; drawbacks to formal and public reviews, especially those conducted under sunshine laws; and the distribution of authority for publicly controlled/independent institutions. Appended materials include information on the study and the commission members, a bibliography, and a list of persons interviewed or consulted. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247879

Presidents Make a Difference

Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 017 705

A Report of the Commission on
Strengthening Presidential Leadership

Sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges

Directed by Clark Kerr

Funded by the Carnegie Corporation
October 1984

Table of Contents

Foreword *ix*

A Notation on Encounters with Reality *xv*

I. Expressing Concern for an Effective and Attractive Presidency 1

II. Searching for the New President 15

III. Aiding Entrance to the Presidency 31

IV. Supporting the President 43

V. Carrying on Reviews 51

VI. Determining the Length of Term and Handling the Exit 61

VII. Governing Multicampus Relationships 69

VIII. Guiding Public Authority 79

IX. Conducting the Presidency 87

X. Concluding Comments 97

Appendix A. The Study 105

Appendix B. Selected List of Recent Related Publications Not Noted In The Text 117

Appendix C. List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted 119

One thing is clear:
colleges must have presidents
and
it makes a great difference
who they are.

Harold W. Stoke
The American College President

Foreword

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges established the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership and asked it to answer the following questions:

1. Is it now more difficult to get highly qualified persons to serve as presidents of colleges and universities than it was in earlier times—more specifically the early 1960s?

Yes. One major reason is that now only about one-half of top academic officers (the one greatest single source of new presidents) are interested in becoming presidents.

2. Are terms of presidents now shorter than they were in earlier times—specifically the 1960s?

Here the answer is in doubt for lack of good data. Certainly they are not as short as they were, on the average, in the late 1960s and early 1970s when the turnover was abnormally high. And certainly there are fewer long-term presidents (defined as those who serve 20 years or more) now than in the early 1960s and prior times. The current average term is seven years with some loss of effectiveness on the way in and way out of each presidency—making the average period of high productivity probably no more than 80 percent of this average seven-year span. On the way in, it takes time to get to know the institution. On the way out, the president (and the board) might wish to hold opportunities to decide important matters open to the successor, or the exiting president might not wish to make unpopular decisions for fear they will impede consideration for future positions, or the current president might simply have lost interest.

3. Are presidents less engaged in making long-term plans and in preparing their institutions for the long-run future

than they were in earlier times? Do they concentrate more on current problems?

Yes and yes. Presidents explain this lower level of preparation for the future in several ways: more pressing current problems and more constraints in responding to them than before; more pressures from many sources on the presidents' time and for their attention; greater uncertainties about the future, which make planning harder; managing decline is more difficult than managing growth and advance planning might actually be counterproductive in terms of exacerbating tensions on campus (the only safe plan, one president said, is "pie in the sky, and there is no more pie in the sky"); and the relatively short terms of presidents, which reduce the opportunity, and even the incentive, to plan for the future. Also, some presidents have been repudiated by their boards when they have made tough and controversial plans; the word of this spreads quickly and widely.

We were also asked (as a fourth major question) if we could identify actions that would make the presidencies of American colleges and universities more attractive to highly qualified persons, more agreeable to incumbents, and more effective in guiding the long-term future of their institutions. Here, once again, the answer is yes: We could identify such actions, and this report centers on the actions we suggest. Most presidents would like to be more effective as leaders and are convinced they could be if less restrained and more supported. We recognize full well, however, that some presidents would like to lie low and survive, and have no interest in being unleashed—however much other segments of the community might wish for (and higher education in general might need) more effective leadership.

The "we" above is the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership appointed by the AGB. The members of this Commission are listed at the end of this foreword and identified at the end of Appendix A. We met to exchange views and perceptions, and we conducted (with the assistance of others associated with us) over 800 interviews with current and past presidents, with board members, with persons who have refused presidencies, with executive search consultants, and with many others. These interviews have reached into all major segments of higher education and regions of the country.

The four major questions posed to us came from board members of AGB, reflecting the concerns of the membership of AGB. (A brief statement about the study is given in Appendix A.)

Two other reports or series of essays will issue from this investigation. One will be by David Riesman, assisted by Sharon Elliott Fuller, and by Clark Kerr, assisted by Marian Gade. These reports will go into much more detail about what we found out concerning the changed circumstances of the presidencies of American colleges and universities. This current report, thus, is an action document; description and explanation will be the themes of the other two reports or series of essays.

We want to make clear that we recognize fully the immense variety among institutions of higher education in the United States. *The only truthful generalization about colleges and universities in America that can be made without exception is that no truthful generalization can be made without exception except for this generalization.*

Consequently, in what follows, we do not make very many general recommendations; rather we concentrate on specific suggestions to be considered where they are deemed appropriate by those closest to each situation. Were we to list exceptions to each course of action proposed, this document would become cumbersome; besides, participants in each situation are better able than we to note the appropriate exceptions and qualifications. All the suggestions we make, however, we believe will be found to fit a substantial number of situations across the United States, and individual institutions can use these suggestions as a checklist for examining their own conduct. The many suggestions we make reflect both the complex web of relationships surrounding all presidencies and the diversity of the contexts within which presidencies are conducted.

Our suggestions fall into the *can* and *should* category; we have stayed away from suggestions that *should* but *cannot* be followed. The suggestions we make are based upon our own experiences and the experiences of the many persons we interviewed; these experiences grow out of involvements in thousands of actual situations. In making these suggestions, we hope to encourage interest in and creative thought about the conditions of leadership and the conduct of leaders.

We all have come to agree with these two statements of our fellow member Joseph Kauffman:

1. "Our colleges and universities are in desperate need of leadership."

2. Colleges and universities "must demonstrate that they can treat their leaders humanely and respectfully."[1]

The presidencies of colleges and universities always have been and always will be full of complexities, of contradictions, of conflicts, of challenges. This cannot be changed. We believe, however, that many unnecessary burdens are placed upon presidents in the conduct of their duties. Presidents have found that these burdens weigh particularly heavily because they are unnecessary and because new constraints, outside the control of higher education, bind the presidents as never before in their freedom of action. We note these constraints in our Concluding Comments.

We have found that many trustees and certainly most presidents welcome a careful look at the presidency as American higher education enters a new period of uncertainty and meets new tests; that many faculty members are realizing the need for effective leadership under the conditions and challenges that surround most institutions; and that students, currently at least, are generally pressing less hard on the presidency in ways that restrict the office's freedom of action.

It is not surprising that we have found great interest among trustees but it may be more surprising that so many faculty members, as reported by the deans and provosts who work directly with faculties, have a similar interest in stronger presidential leadership. Faculty members, in the current situation, have less mobility and thus are more tied to the institutions with which they are now affiliated, are ever more concerned with the deterioration of their salaries in real terms, are occasionally worried about the survival of their campuses and more frequently about cutbacks in the programs in which they are involved, and are nearly universally apprehensive about the availability of new resources to make their endeavors more fruitful. Therefore, these faculty members—above all other campus constituencies—have a new interest in restoring the effectiveness of leadership. The many essential purposes served by effective presidents are noted in our Concluding Comments.

Thus, after nearly two decades of increasing restrictions on the conduct of most presidencies, a time may now have come when many associated with higher education are willing, and some even eager, to give leadership a better chance. We seek to show how this can be done.

Members of the National Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership:

Vernon R. Alden
David G. Brown
Marguerite Corbally
Merrimon Cuninggim
Daniel J. Evans
E. K. Fretwell Jr.
Sister Ann Ida Gannon, B.V.M.
Janet D. Greenwood

Joseph F. Kauffman
Leslie Koltai
Barry A. Munitz
John W. Nason
Mary Louise Petersen
Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr.
Donna Shavlik
Leonard H. O. Spearman

Donald M. Stewart

Clark Kerr
Chair

David Riesman
Special Consultant

Notes for The Foreword

1. Joseph F. Kauffman, "The New College President: Expectations and Realities," *Educational Record,* vol. 58, number 2, Spring 1977, p. 168.

A Notation on Encounters with Reality

A Notation on Encounters with Reality

Many trustees and a few presidents may be surprised both at the great variety of problems we found in a substantial number of institutions and at the great number of suggestions we make to alleviate those problems. A few presidents may be surprised because their own situations are so comparatively favorable and because presidents usually know the detailed circumstances in only a small number of institutions beyond their own—and these within the same type of institution. Many trustees are similarly limited in their knowledge of institutions other than their own.

Additionally, a gap generally exists between the private lives and the public lives of presidents (and of many other persons in the limelight). The trustees see mostly the public lives of presidents. A veil, sometimes thin and sometimes thick, obscures perceptions of the private lives and thoughts of presidents. We came across more than one Pagliacci situation where public performance relates not at all to private feelings. Many presidents are, and even must be, stoics.

In our interviews, which were confidential, the presidents spoke frankly about their private reactions to their public lives. They hold rather lonely positions and have few confidants with whom they can talk as they could with us. We even found presidents and spouses who—until we talked with them—had not been frank with one another about how they saw their respective roles.

This is not to suggest that all presidents are in situations they think could be improved. We found that about one-fourth of all presidents are quite satisfied with their situations (some are even euphoric); about one-half are clearly more satisfied than dissatisfied most of the time; and about one-fourth are dissatisfied—some even in despair. This observation of ours is consistent with the average 30 percent turnover of presidents every two years[1]: approximately one-quarter or one third are in some stage of leaving or thinking of leaving, voluntarily or involuntarily, during any two-year period.

The three groupings of presidents are quite unevenly distributed among types of institutions. Generally, but by no means universally, presidents consider themselves to be in better situations in private (rather than public), in four-year (rather than two-year), in religiously oriented (rather than non-religiously-oriented), and in academically elite (rather than non-elite) institutions. The type of institution in which a president is located will thus substantially affect his or her perceptions of the presidency, and trustees similarly will be affected by the type of institution they serve. Consequently, some presidents and some trustees will have a more upbeat view of the situation than we present here; others, a more downbeat view.

Generally, trustees will have a more positive view of the presidency than presidents do, because trustees see more of the public conduct and less of the private concerns of presidents. We should also note that we asked (among other questions) what improvements presidents would like implemented and this, quite naturally, solicited both commendations and complaints (but more of the latter than of the former) about actual situations.

We should like to emphasize that much is done right—and some things to perfection in some places—but also that situations vary enormously, that people vary enormously, and that the fits between situations and individuals also vary enormously. The suggestions we make will, of course, be most useful where the fit needs to be improved.

Knowing reality is the first step in knowing what to do or what not to do. We have sought to explore reality in its many dimensions while simultaneously recognizing that reality is subject to many perceptions in addition to our own. After our careful examination of the state of leadership in American higher education, we are confident that our recommendations and suggestions merit serious attention. If this advice is implemented, the quality of leadership in many of the nation's colleges and universities will be substantially improved. And improvement is needed. The central reality is that the American college and university presidency is in trouble.

Notes for A Notation on Encounters with Reality

1. "Fact-File. Turnover of Administrators, 1980-82, by Position and Type of Institution," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* vol. 26, no. 16 (June 15, 1983), p. 26.

1

Chapter One

Expressing Concern for an Effective and Attractive Presidency

Expressing Concern for an Effective and Attractive Presidency

The second—not the first—most important single responsibility of a board is to select a president; the first most important responsibility is to have a presidency that is effective and thus potentially attractive to highly qualified persons.

Conversations with individuals who have refused presidencies (sometimes repeatedly), with top academic officers on campuses (who constitute much of the pool from which presidents are drawn), with professional search personnel, and with ex-presidents indicate that the attractiveness of the presidency has deteriorated.

Persons who have refused presidencies frequently note that the management of decline, which many campuses either have experienced or are likely to face, is not as attractive as the management of growth. Some also note that the new ambience of greater participation by more groups, each expecting consultation, can lead to exhausting multiple negotiations with less likelihood of results than in earlier times. Too many people want to get in on the act; too many lights flash "walk" and "don't walk" at the same time. Others say that their modern lifestyles do not easily accommodate what the presidency requires: such long hours of work by them (and perhaps their spouses) and such a wide range of personal contacts determined by the job and not chosen by the individual.

At least half of the academic officers note that the presidency has become a heavily external job with more emphasis than in the past on fund raising and on public relations, and with less contact with faculty and students and academic issues. Many individuals primarily interested in the academic side of campus life believe they will be better off as a provost or a dean of the faculty or a vice president of academic affairs than as a president.

Professional search personnel say that many of the brightest, most ambitious young persons interested in executive positions now gravitate to the study of business administration or law, and then to private industry, business, and finance.

Ex-presidents sometimes complain in retrospect of the unexpectedly heavy costs of the presidency to their academic careers, to their family life, to their financial situations, and to their reserves of physical and psychological energy; they say that, under current conditions, they would never do it again.

Many able persons, however, still are interested in presidential careers, and we were all impressed with the high quality of most of the current presidents. Many presidents are better than the position they hold.

Yet, we were also impressed with how many boards and how many professional persons engaged in searches have reported refusals of presidencies by competent people, the difficulty of persuading others, and the small numbers of available candidates found to be fully qualified out of the large numbers who expressed an interest. To help reverse this downhill trend, we suggest remedies in what follows.

This all means that boards should be even more than usually concerned with the quality of the presidencies for which the boards are responsible and which they periodically are called upon to fill. Board members need to realize that the problem of inadequate leadership, where it is thought to exist, may be located as much in the nature of the presidency they have helped to shape as in the performance of the particular president they have chosen.

Recommendations
and
Suggestions

Because of the decline in the attractiveness of many presidencies (as viewed by some able candidates and also by many incumbents), each governing board should periodically review the character of its institution's presidency (how it looks to the incumbent, for example, and how it might look to prospective occupants) and should make the necessary changes.

Examine the presidency. Most boards have members who are themselves executives and who can evaluate the quality of the presidency from their own direct experience. But it might also be helpful to have some outside advice: from respected presidents or ex-presidents of similar collegiate institutions, from board mentors supplied by AGB or other very experienced board members from other institutions, or from professional search personnel. One time for such an examination is at the outset of the recruitment of a new president, but there are other opportunities—the examination might be part of the periodic review of institutional governance, for example.

Make the president a full board colleague. The president is usually a member of the board (and may even be its chair, as at the University of Michigan, at Harvard, and at a small number of other institutions), but membership on the board is not the case in at least one-third of all institutions. Wherever possible, the president should be made a member of the board, and where this is prohibited by law (as in many community colleges), the president should be given the status of a board member in practice with all the same rights and privileges except for a formal vote.

One alternative to the president serving as a board member is to make the president also secretary to the board, as at Cuyahoga Community College: with control over all agenda materials and other communications to the board and in charge of transmission of decisions by the board; and with the right to attend all sessions of the board except those concerning evaluation of presidential performance. The University of North Carolina System has a carefully drafted *Code* defining the role of the president which is worthy of careful study[1].

It is also helpful, as we shall note later and for the same reason of equality of status, for presidents to hold a faculty position.

Relate the president to the staff. The president should have, as is the case in all successful business enterprises, adequate and competent staff to carry out the full range of tasks for which the president is responsible. The board needs to take responsibility in ensuring this, given faculty sensitivities to the size of administrative staffs.

Many presidents told us that "one person can't do it. You have to rely on a team." It is particularly important that the president have adequate assistance in his or her own immediate office; so many presidents report a sense of being "always behind" in carrying out their obligations of keeping up with the mail, with phone calls, with preparation for and follow-up on meetings, and with many other constant pressures—all of which can be shared by competent staff. A skilled director of the presidential staff, in charge of the flow of paperwork and other communications, can be very helpful.

All officers should report to the board of trustees through the president.

The president should not be required to retain officers with whom the president cannot work effectively. We found many situations where the new president inherited a staff and could not make all the changes in it he or she might wish because of "untouchables" protected in their positions by the board or by important board members. Some such untouchables seek to undermine the president, which is of course unconscionable. We shall return again to this issue in a later section.

Relate the president to academic affairs. "The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty."

"The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of and in consultation with the appropriate faculty."

"As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate."

These are central points of advice taken from the 1966 "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," developed by the American Association of University Professors in consultation with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges[2]; and we, in turn, accept them.

We have found, however, that many presidents today consider themselves less the chief academic officer than this policy statement suggests and less than they themselves might wish. They see themselves as drawn outside academic life by the demands of their external roles of fund raising and public relations, and pushed out by faculty assertion of control over academic affairs. We would add that some of them also seem to have lost influence over academic affairs by default—by not asserting their authority. Many have relinquished essential influence over academic affairs to provosts or deans or vice presidents for academic affairs; some of these officers are eager to assert their own control, and some even insist that they are responsible primarily to the faculty and not to the president. The student market has, additionally, set much actual academic policy in recent years, regardless of administrative or faculty judgment.

The president should be the chief academic officer in fact, and the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate academic policy from the special point of view of the long-term and overall welfare of the campus, which the president is in the best position to understand and to foster.

We do not favor splitting the presidency into an outside person and an inside person, each with his or her own territory: the outside person essentially reporting to the board and the inside person to the faculty. It is important for the same person to be able to understand and to coordinate outside and inside relationships. We spoke to one president whose background was in development. When he was hired as president, the trustees' priorities were for him to raise money, recruit students, and mend fences in the community. He told them that, if he came, academic quality would be his top priority. He found that by pursuing academic quality first, it was subsequently easier to carry out the trustees' priorities than it otherwise would have been.

Also, "the trustees cannot properly abdicate all concern with educational matters," as Laird Bell, then chairman of the board of the University of Chicago, once stated.[3] Trustees can show their concern, among other ways, by appointing a president who is qualified to serve as chief academic officer, by supporting the president once appointed in this role, and by evaluating the president on the conduct of this role and making it clear to all concerned that they will do so. In particular, the president may need encouragement and support in showing an interest in the content of general education (learning skills and liberal learning opportunities) that go beyond the requirements of the majors that belong particularly to the faculties and beyond the choices of electives that belong to the individual students.

A president is better able to serve effectively as chief academic officer if the president is a member of the faculty and accepted as such.

Relate the president carefully to the union of faculty members. Where unionization of faculty (with bargaining rights) has taken place, it is usually better not to put the president in direct confrontation with the union in the negotiation of contracts. Negotiations are more appropriately carried on by some other officer of the institution or by an outside specialist. As a matter of practice in many public institutions, negotiations are conducted by an agent of the state (the state, in the end, must finance the costs of any contract)—but this approach can seriously impair the autonomy of institutions of higher education and we do not suggest it. The contract should, in any event, be subject to approval by the board on the advice of the president, especially on all academic matters.

Provide areas of initiative open to the president. Most presidents want to make a difference. Two possibilities to advance this expectation are: (1) a policy to recover one to three percent of a budget each year by eliminating old programs in order to undertake new programs or to improve remaining on-going ones, and (2) a policy to set aside one percent of the budget for discretionary use by the president on ad hoc projects—to finance a symposium, to support a faculty or student research project, to assist with some cultural event not already budgeted. Any major initiatives, of course, should be subject to advice from the faculty and reporting to the board.

Provide a concerned and effective board. From our own investigations we found the following to be the most important in terms of an effective presidency:

- a board composed of persons who are devoted to the long-term and overall welfare of the institution;
- a board whose members have long enough terms so that the president can be assured that he or she will be working for at least three years with a board on which a majority of members were involved in his or her selection (this suggests terms of at least six years and preferably more);
- and a board not dominated by one individual or any small group of individuals.

The relationship between the board chair and the president is especially important. "A good board chairman can be a major factor in making the job easier," we were told by a former president. "By that I mean one who is available to listen, to act as a preliminary sounding board, and who will be supportive, never undercutting the president or the institution with governor, legislators, faculty, students, or the public."

We also call attention to the two AGB-Scott reports on *Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Private Colleges and Universities*[4] and *Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Public Colleges and Universities.*[5] In particular, we endorse Recommendation 1 in the second of these reports: "Trustees of public governing boards should be appointed by the governor or other established authority from a list of nominees who have been carefully screened by a special committee." We also endorse Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, and 17, which supplement Recommendation 1.[6]

Publicly elected boards generally have proved to be less effective than boards composed primarily of appointed members—appointed either by the board itself or by the alumni or by public authority. One of the drawbacks to publicly elected boards is that election campaigns cost money, and abuses can occur when an elected board member incurs debts to be repaid in policies and in favorable decisions. Exceptions are public boards where active alumni participation largely determines who is elected (as for the board of the University of Illinois) or where tradition and prestige set high standards for those elected (University of Michigan).

Appointment permits (but does not guarantee) more careful review of credentials and reduces the chances of domination by representatives of special interest groups chosen in the course of elections with low voter participation. If selection is to be by election, the elections should be only general elections (not off-year or special elections) with the prospect of substantial voter turnout; interim openings can be filled by appointment. Because of clear conflicts of interest, we do not believe that elected public officials should be ex officio members of boards. We note that the New York State Board of Regents has had generally good experience, over a long period of time, with selection of members by the legislature.

An effective presidency starts, but does not end, with an effective board. We have found that the following tend to go together: an effective board, an effective chair of the board, an effective presidency, an effective president.

Notes for Chapter One

1. *The Code,* Board of Governors, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1975.
2. *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports,* 1977, 3rd Printing, Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, pp. 42 and 43.
3. Laird Bell, "From the Trustee's Corner," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin,* vol. XLII, no. 3, October 1956, p. 354.
4. National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection, *Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Public Colleges and Universities,* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980. (Report of a commission chaired by former Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina.)
5. ________. *Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Private Colleges and Universities,* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980. (Report of a commission chaired by former Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina.)
6. Recommendation 2: "A nominating committee for each institution should be appointed by the governor. It should

consist of at least five people and its composition should take into account the diversity of the state, region, or local community the institution primarily serves."

Recommendation 3: "The nominating committee should have carefully delineated responsibilities. Among these should be:

- to assess board membership needs in terms of background, skills, and diversity (ethnic, racial, sexual, age, geographic, social, and political);
- to consult with trustees and the chief executive;
- to determine which of the basic board responsibilities need to be stressed in a given appointment and balance this need with the assessment of the board;
- to screen candidates for nomination, including review of trustees eligible for reappointment."

Recommendation 4: "The search for qualified candidates should be continuous. It should include four steps:

- identification of the statutory and other qualifications necessary to be a trustee of each particular institution;
- publication of the process (time limits and deadlines) under which the search functions;
- a broad call for prospective candidates for nomination including consultation with the president, administrators, faculty, students, and each board member to ascertain membership needs;
- identification of candidates for trusteeship by members of the nominating committee."

Recommendation 5: "Qualified candidates should be carefully screened. The screening of candidates should involve at least five steps as follows:

- analysis of biographical information;
- review of supporting documents provided by nominators;
- identification of a group of "finalists" whose personal and professional background and sense of commitment can be probed in more detail;
- interviews with each of the finalists to (1) determine their interest and knowledge of the institution and trusteeship, (2) assess their individual abilities, and personal characteristics to determine how they would benefit the board, and (3) explain the requirements of the trusteeship;
- preparation of a statement of each person to be recommended specifying the reasons why the person would be a good trustee and what particular board need(s) would be filled by his or her appointment."

Recommendation 17: "In states where trustees are elected by the public, nominating committees, as specified in Recommendations 2 through 5, should be appointed to assure that all candidates on the ballot are highly qualified."

2

Chapter Two

Searching for the New President

Searching for the New President

The selection of a president is part of a process, not a single episode to be handled by itself as a short-term emergency. A lot of things can and often do go wrong with the process.

The process starts with the conclusion of the prior presidency. Possible candidates will wish to know how long the previous president served, what were the reasons for leaving, what arrangements were made to ease the termination, and how the prior president was treated by the board and by other constituencies.

The interim period between the decision to terminate and the arrival on the job of the new person must be handled carefully. In particular, the power vacuum that sometimes occurs might be filled by an internal candidate seeking to take over but who is sometimes doomed to disappointment, by a noncandidate vice president taking over and then being unwilling to relinquish authority, or by the board chair and/or committee chair taking over and liking it too much—and the presidency withers. Dominant faculty members might also increase their dominance during this transition period.

The first step in the actual search should be, but seldom is, a search for the future of the institution. The board and the faculty should develop a view of what the institution wants to make of its future and what type of leadership will be most helpful in achieving that vision. There is no such thing as an all-purpose talent. In fact, some talents are at least partially mutually exclusive. Thoughtful academic leadership and exuberant fund raising may not go fully hand in hand; likewise, detailed budget management and the shrewd generation of external political support are talents not always combined in the same person.

At least four obstacles, we found, often stand in the way of getting an advance vision of the institution's future: (1) the lack of time under the pressure of getting a new president in place; (2) the lack of an agency for careful consideration—the search committee often believes that a vision of the future goes beyond its proper assignment; (3) the tendency to compare candidates with one another rather than with the requirements of the particular presidency in the light of the future needs of the institution; and (4) the desire of the board for the new president, once chosen, to participate in the process of defining the future needs.

The greatest damage done to the search process, however, usually occurs once it is underway, if (by law, by practice, by leaks, or by investigative reporting) it is thrown open to general public scrutiny of individual names under consideration. Sometimes this openness is mandated by state sunshine laws, which forbid closed meetings on certain topics. Although it is quite legitimate and, in fact, highly desirable to make public who is conducting the search process and what steps are being followed, the placing of names in the open has some common unfortunate consequences:

- Many persons refuse to be considered. Internal candidates face current embarrassment and difficult prospective relations on campus in the future if they do not get the position. External candidates with good positions endanger their continuing relations in those positions if it is known they are looking elsewhere. We heard over and over again from highly qualified potential candidates, many of them sitting presidents, that they either did not enter or withdrew prematurely from searches solely because sunshine laws or practices in personnel selection precluded confidentiality, and they could not afford to be undermined in their current assignments by general knowledge that they were looking elsewhere.

- Candidates in such an open process are subject to public demands (by special interest groups) that they declare their positions in advance on issues later to be decided; these demands are made at a time when the candidates have no opportunity to consult or to study the issues carefully. Private demands for advance commitments can also be made in confidential searches, and they are equally unwise.
- Once chosen through such an open process, the new president before accepting the appointment is placed in an excellent position to bargain for extremely favorable conditions against a board in a vulnerable position because it has committed itself publicly—unless the conditions have all been spelled out in advance, which is almost impossible to do.
- It can be demeaning to a new president if it becomes apparent that he was not the first choice for the presidency, as often is the case. It is also embarrassing for the institution to be perceived as not being able to obtain its first choice or choices.
- Sunshine procedures also give rise to subterranean devices for getting around the laws, which constitute a public farce concealing a back room deal.

We are sympathetic with some of the objectives of sunshine laws and other open practices in personnel matters because they keep interested publics more fully informed and they create opportunities for large numbers of persons to participate in the process. They also provide pressures for fuller consideration of female and minority candidates. However, there are other ways of accomplishing each of these important purposes.

We are convinced that, as an overall result, sunshine laws and practices have most often resulted in what David Riesman has called "search and destroy" missions—destroying potential candidacies and destroying the chances for an unencumbered entry of the new president into the position.

The sunshine approach to search is a road paved with many good intentions. We believe, however, that this road, where now followed, merits reexamination. "Sunshine laws are blunt tools that often serve neither the institutional interest nor the public interest." This statement of one president was echoed by many others we interviewed.

We speak here only of sunshine laws and practices in personnel matters and not in the general conduct of board decision making, although there are also problems in connection with investments, contract negotiations, property purchases and sales, and some other specific decisions. More generally, sunshine procedures make it harder to handle problems early and quietly when they are small rather than later and publicly when they are large.

We favor full disclosure of the process of the search, frequent status reports on how it stands, and opportunities for representatives of major segments of the campus community to be consulted (including but by no means limited to serving on the search committee) but with strict confidentiality on the names under consideration. The only important purpose of the search is to obtain the best possible new president. This imperative stands above the right of everybody to know what is going on, however desirable this otherwise might be.

Within higher education, the choice of faculty members, of trustees (except where they are popularly elected), and of students is not conducted under sunshine law restrictions. We also note that in other major sectors of society—in corporations, in hospitals, in churches, in schools—confidentiality of names enhances the candidate pool. Higher education cannot afford to select its presidents otherwise.

The public accepts that juries deliberate in private, that editorial boards of newspapers meet behind closed doors, that the cabinets of the President of the United States and of governors assemble *in camera*, that labor and management negotiate privately, that conference committees between legislative branches reach their solutions unaided by public scrutiny, that judges are selected for appointment in confidential ways. All decisions of interest to the public should be made public, but the public recognizes that these decisions need not all be made in public.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Because sunshine laws and practices in personnel matters frequently reduce the opportunities for obtaining the best possible new president, such laws and practices should be subject to reexamination and change. Names of presidential candidates should be kept confidential to reduce the chances of withdrawal or other embarrassments. It is essential that every effort be made to ensure that the processes followed are fair and that all candidates are considered on their merits.

Higher education officials and public officials should work to change sunshine laws that require public disclosure of candidates' *names. Where sunshine laws cannot be eliminated, they might at least provide for disclosure only of the final names under consideration (three, for example) with the advance permission of these persons. If the disclosure of names is required by institutional practice—rather than by law—this practice should be eliminated.*

Our comments apply to all personnel selections, not to presidents exclusively.

Handle separations sensitively. The decision to terminate a president should be by action of the entire board, and the board chair or a small committee should conduct the president's separation with sensitivity. Where feasible, lead time should be given the incumbent to relocate voluntarily. The advice and assistance of a professional personnel firm can be helpful in conducting a process that industry calls outplacement. The many separations initiated by presidents also require sensitive handling of the announcement and the terms of separation. (Separation management is dealt with in more detail later in this report.)

Carry out institutional self-examination. This should be the first priority if it has not already taken place. It is more appropriately done by the board as a whole in consultation with the faculty and other campus constituencies than by the search committee alone. It is of extreme importance to match the institution and the president, and this requires a clear perception of the needs of the first and the abilities of the second and of the fit between them.

Gain time. It is better to make a good than a fast decision. An acting president from within should not be a person who is a possible candidate—though an honest "draft" should not be rigidly rejected—and, preferably, should be close to retirement. An alternative is an interim president from the outside chosen from the many experienced persons now available around the nation.

Look broadly. The search is often confined to persons not only within higher education but also within the same category of institution. This excludes many fine possibilities.

Some excellent presidents have been drawn from the ranks of ambassadors, foundation executives, leaders of congress with high interest in educational policies, top assistants to mayors and to governors, corporation executives (and particularly from persons with educational responsibilities within corporations), and leaders of scientific research endeavors. Concern for academic policy can be just as alive and informed among persons drawn from these sources as among those currently in faculty positions.

The exclusion of persons from another category of institution and from nontraditional candidate pools neglects the fact that high talents are more easily transferable from one administrative position to another than from a nonadministrative position to an administrative one within the same category of institution.

Above all, it is essential that all candidates, all nominees, and all persons otherwise considered be evaluated on the basis of their individual abilities and character, regardless of sex or marital status, race or ethnic origin. Talent should be recognized wherever talent exists and should not be confined by category. For too long, higher education in the United States has denied itself access to more than half of the executive talent available to it—and higher education has suffered grievously as a result. We were impressed by the great effectiveness of many of the women and minority-member presidents we interviewed.

Look internally. We find a frequent tendency to overlook internal candidates that other institutions later find attractive and an almost universal tendency not to seek to develop internal possibilities in advance—as is done so successfully, for example, at MIT and in many Jesuit institutions as well as in other institutions under the guidance of Catholic orders. A board, however, may first wish to determine if there are internal possibilities that should be taken seriously before opening the process to internal candidates. Disappointed internal candidates have been known to create grave difficulties for the person finally chosen; other internal candidates have organized divisive campaigns to obtain the presidency. Thus, it is better to eliminate any unacceptable internal candidates early in the process—and then carry any fully acceptable candidate to selection unless some clearly better choice becomes available from outside. Internal candidates will already have faculty status, both their strengths and weaknesses will be more fully evident than for persons from the outside, and they are likely to have an established loyalty. Yet only 15 percent of new presidents are chosen from the inside.

Prepare possible presidential candidates. One of the many ways in which higher education differs from business and industry, as well as from primary and secondary education, is the lack of systematic preparation of people who move into upper management and leadership positions. Except for a few university programs designed to educate future community college administrators, some internships, and a few management institutes, little specific training is available for persons wishing to become college presidents.

Many of the community college presidents we talked to praised the Kellogg Foundation program in selected universities that trained many administrators and presidents for this sector during its great growth period of the 1960s and 1970s. Now that generation of leaders has retired, or is retiring, and there is concern about where the next generation of community college leaders is to come from. Consideration needs to be given to some new university or foundation-supported programs that would do for the colleges of the 1990s and beyond what the Kellogg-sponsored centers did for the past two decades.

Most presidents now learn through on-the-job experience, and they usually come to the position with some gaps in their backgrounds. Naivete about what boards of trustees are and what they do is a frequent deficiency; lack of experience in financial management, collective bargaining, and fund raising are others. Administrators and boards need to be concerned about providing a wide range of opportunities and experiences for potential future leaders, possibly rotating vice presidents and other executives among functional areas. Training by one institution will benefit higher education as a whole as administrators become presidents elsewhere.

Special efforts should be made to provide opportunities for women and members of minority groups to prepare themselves for executive positions. Presidents have a special responsibility to carry on this effort.

Focus on current needs, not past mistakes. The new president should be chosen on the basis of future oriented criteria, not simply because the candidate has characteristics the prior president lacked.

Search for leadership that will accept personal costs as the price of action. Too many committees look for people who have never been engaged in controversy. They should be looking, instead, for people who have been willing to accept controversy in the course of doing good things, in moving their institution ahead. One great hazard, particularly with large search committees representing diverse constituencies—"Noah's Ark" committees, to borrow another phrase from David Riesman—is that the person finally chosen simply is the one to whom no one objects strongly.

Consider the use of professional help. Search firms can bring experience, nationwide contacts, and an administrative mechanism to the search process. They function best when they stay in the background and provide another source of advice and assistance while principals from the college actually conduct the search. Search professionals may, however, be more oriented toward external than internal candidates. Multicampus systems sometimes develop their own internal professional assistance.

The board must take responsibility for the quality of the search process, as it does for the final choice.

Consult without divulging. It is important to draw on faculty and student (and, where appropriate, alumni) advice but on a confidential basis. All direct participants should be pledged to confidentiality. Generally, the smaller the committee, the more likely it is to act confidentially and expeditiously. While appropriate consultation and achievement of consent is essential, it is the board itself that makes, and takes responsibility for, the final decision—and no one else. Any failures belong to it alone. Others can help with the search, but the board and only the board makes the ultimate decision.

Give individual treatment to each candidate. It is better to bring one candidate at a time to the campus for mutual explorations than to have several visit simultaneously. The latter approach is very likely to break confidentiality, and might also discourage the prospective presidents most desired. The search process should not be turned into a yard sale with all the neighbors looking on.

Each seriously considered candidate should be given ready access to the budget; the financial statement; recent accreditation reports; pertinent data about each trustee; the bylaws and standing orders; any union contracts; the delegation of authority to faculty; data on the flow of student applications, acceptances, registrations, and retention; and such other information as may individually be requested.

Candidates should be prepared to take the initiative in requesting such information, for some board members themselves are not fully informed about important aspects of the institution. A disturbing number of presidents reported to us that they found major financial problems about which they had not been told—including debts running into the millions of dollars in some places. One search committee told the successful presidential candidate: "We have no financial problems," but he later found that there had been an operating deficit every year for the prior ten years.

It is important that the interview be friendly and open. Candidates should be consulted about whom they would like to see on a campus visit. In few of the searches that came to our attention was the candidate asked whom he or she wanted to see and many people to whom the candidates should have been introduced were not included in the schedule.

Each prospect should be treated as an honored guest and a potential friend and colleague.

Emphasize searching not selecting. The emphasis should be on search and not just selection (or rejection until only one name is left) from names otherwise made available. Search implies an active process of looking for the best possible candidates and persuading them to take an interest. As one state official observed, "Part of the problem is that the people who want to be presidents are not the ones that should be presidents. Many of those who say they don't want to be presidents are the ones you really want to recruit."

Requiring a formal signed application of candidacy or prearranged letters of recommendation are aspects of selection not of search, and they serve as barriers to interest among many qualified persons. "Institutions that act as if their presidency is the highest office in the land and deal only with those people who are candidates and are willing to run for it usually get exactly what they deserve," said one former system head.

Prospects should have the feeling they are being sought out, not that they are supplicants. One president remarked, "I'll believe people are serious about leadership in higher education when they pay as much attention to getting a president as they do to getting a winning football coach."

This theme of search is central to the report on *Presidential Search* by John W. Nason[1] for AGB, which also includes a much broader discussion of considerations than is outlined here. We have highlighted only those aspects that our investigations have shown to be most crucial.

A good way to start an effective presidency is to conduct an effective search for both the desired future of the institution and the best leadership to achieve that future.

Notes for Chapter Two

1. John W. Nason, *Presidential Search*, Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1979 (revised edition 1984).

3

Chapter Three

Aiding Entrance to the Presidency

Aiding Entrance to the Presidency

When asked what was discussed with him in the entrance process, one president replied: "Absolutely nothing." It is unfortunate that entrance into the presidency can be so neglected, because many understandings and arrangements need to be worked out in advance and, when they are not, trouble often begins insidiously. Too much tends to be left to the tacit understanding that both sides will act in good faith in the "genteel tradition"—to use a phrase from Santayana.

Many community colleges have gone beyond the traditional approach and have formal contracts spelling out in detail the conditions of the position—including a job description, the nature of any review, and the provisions for exit—even going so far in one college as to provide for arbitration if a president wants to protest dismissal. This development of formal contracts is also often done in industry. We do not necessarily suggest extention of this formal contractual approach to other types of institutions of higher education, but we do note that community colleges have often pointed the way during the last two decades and that other institutions have had a tendency to follow.

We strongly favor a relationship between the board and the new president based on trust and reciprocal loyalty—where possible. But this trust and loyalty should be aided by advance understandings on important matters. In the absence of these understandings before the appointment is formally made, the president might not receive what should be forthcoming or, at the other extreme, might take advantage of a favorable bargaining position after the board has announced its choice; and in between these extremes often lie substantial areas of uncertainty.

In this area of common neglect, the most neglected topic is the role of the spouse. Spouses frequently report that no one talked with them at all about what was expected of them and what support would be provided to them, nor were they given advice on what to do and not to do in some sensitive areas. Often boards still take spouses for granted in an age when this simply should not be allowed to happen.

We asked one president's wife, "Did the board of trustees pay attention to your needs at the time your husband took the job?"

"No," was her answer.

"Did you see this house before you came to the campus to live in it?"

"No," she again replied, beginning to laugh.

"How, then, did you cope?"

"By being raised a Methodist preacher's kid—I was prepared to make the best of things, no matter what."

Spouses, too often, are unconsulted or even unnoticed in advance; they are unadvised, unsupported, and unappreciated along the way while still being subject to high (if often unstated) expectations for contributions to the institution.

Spouses, and other family members, should be treated as independent individuals not subject to any obligations to the institution except as they are freely undertaken.

Several types of general situations exist: (1) where there is no spouse; (2) where the spouse is totally inactive in campus affairs; (3) where the spouse acts on a "free choice" policy of participating on an ad hoc basis; (4) where the spouse is regularly active in only a limited number of occasions; (5) where the spouse is regularly active in campus social affairs on a full-time or substantial part-time basis; and (6) where the spouse acts as a "partner" with agreed-upon responsibilities in addition to the social arena. Each of these situations can be satisfactory and deserves consideration.

By a wide margin, we found more dissatisfaction among spouses, even among the free-choice spouses but particularly among the fully active and partner spouses, than we did among presidents.

About half of all spouses are still in the active or partner category, although this proportion is falling. Most of them—but by no means all—are disenchanted, or resentful, or angry, or in revolt. One spouse reported that the first sign of appreciation she had received for all her effort and hard work was at a dinner in connection with a twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of her husband as president.

The attitude of the spouse always has an impact on the president and on the effectiveness of the presidency. We cannot stress too strongly our concern for the neglect of the role of the spouse and our consternation at the many horror stories that were described to us. Boards not sufficiently alert to the new conditions in the world of spouses have made grave mistakes.

We believe that the spouse should be able to agree on which role to play, that this role should be understood in advance, and that adequate staff and financial support should be given for whatever active role is chosen. We also believe that only the president or presidential candidate is in a position to clarify the role of the spouse in response to the wishes of the spouse; it is extremely hard for the spouse to do this on her or his own behalf.

The prospective presidential spouse and other members of the family cannot help but be affected in major ways. Consequently, the president's spouse should be given full opportunity to see the campus and its community in advance, to ask questions, and to discuss terms. The spouse, however, should not be pressured to make unwanted specific commitments, because such commitments under duress will not be gladly kept.

Boards should be totally open to consideration of alternative ways of handling social responsibilities—ways that do not necessarily involve a president's spouse.

Recommendations and Suggestions

We found many misunderstandings between boards and presidents (and presidents' spouses). The board should be prepared to discuss all relevant conditions surrounding (and perquisites attached to) the position of president before any formal announcement is made. Prospective presidents should raise all issues pertinent to them.

A good discussion of conditions is included in Presidential Search *by John W. Nason, referred to earlier. In our interviews, the terms that most concerned presidents were:*

- *what are the expectations the president is expected to fulfill;*
- *what freedom will the president have to select top administrative staff and who are the untouchables;*
- *what, if any, review process will be followed;*
- *what arrangements are contemplated for terms of office and exit;*
- *what are the expectations regarding social entertaining and what support is available;*

- *what role is expected of the spouse;*
- *what part, if any, will be played by a predecessor president?*

Set the terms for the role of the spouse. The active spouse should be given every opportunity to discuss in detail whatever role the spouse is expected and willing to play and what support will be given for any role that is mutually agreed upon. If there is no spouse or if a spouse has chosen not to be actively involved, then other arrangements must be made to carry on the responsibilities necessary to support the social role of the presidency. It should be fully understood that this role can be and is frequently carried out effectively either with or without an active spouse. As one unmarried woman president said, "It's easier this way. Just call food service." Another president has given a key to the house to the local caterer: "I know that when I arrive home, the party will be ready and going." But the president must give the party a personal touch.

Active spouses, as we have heard in our many interviews, want to know in advance what arrangements will be made, especially for the following: housing and its maintenance and staffing (the president and spouse should not be required to live on campus if they do not wish to do so); assistance with entertainment; secretarial assistance; attendance at professional meetings of presidents (we strongly recommend such a provision) and other professional travel; access to an automobile for official use; listing in the telephone directory; and access to office space. We recommend generosity in the provisions that are associated with contributions made by the spouse. It is a still rare but increasing practice to pay a salary to active spouses, particularly to those in the partner category.

Discuss the retention of existing staff. The board and the new president should discuss the prospective future of top level staff directly, openly and early. The high number of untouchables—officers protected in their status by the board as a whole or by one or more members—that we found reflects friendships formed over the years, the reciprocity of favors, the desire of board members to have their own independent channels of information into the campus (including information on the conduct of the president—board members want access to the "full picture," to "the truth" about what is going on), and respect or even admiration for high quality and loyal performance of assignments.

These considerations have always existed. What is new is that some boards, where the turnover of presidents has become rapid, have come to develop a sense of dependency on the second level of officers who keep the place open at all times. It is to this level that board members come to look regularly and reliably as presidents come and go.

To be fair to the new president, however, the board should know in advance—and then inform the new president—what second level staff it would like to keep, what to eliminate, and what to leave open to the judgment of the new president. But the president should be able to override these judgments, and the board on its own initiative should make clear to all staff members that they report and are responsible to the president. The new president, however, is well-advised to give considerable weight to the judgment of the board as a whole. It is good practice for the president by the end of the first year to review past performance and future prospects with all top officers and to announce in advance that this will be done.

Facilitate the negotiation process. When open discussions of terms and conditions, such as salary and benefits, are difficult for the candidate or the board or both, it may be helpful to have a representative of one or the other party or both carry on the negotiations. Professional search persons, where involved, may be helpful in these negotiations, but the parties themselves must, of course, discuss all matters of principle.[1]

Provide an introductory period. Some boards may wish to consider, or new presidents might want to request, a break-in period. This could be used variously to get to know the campus, to visit other similar institutions in depth, to take short courses where needed skills could be added (for example, in the area of financial accounts and budgets). Such a period might last three to six months before daily administrative responsibility is undertaken. Several successful efforts have been undertaken along these lines.

Advise the new president. The campus community is a complex human society, and new presidents can be aided by having some person or group act as an early guide—the chair of the board, for example. Or the search committee or some sub-group within it might be continued for six months to a year to provide such kindly advice. Some carefully selected senior faculty member might be asked to serve as early mentor on administrative-faculty relationships. The spouse, if to be included in campus affairs, also needs advice on the many subtleties of campus life. Special efforts by the board to introduce the new president to important constituencies can be most productive.

Be conscious of the axis of development. The course of relations between the president and the campus community is often set quite early, and this vital relationship should not be allowed to go wrong from the start.

"Simple common sense dictates that the new president and the board leadership work together very early on in developing a *modus operandi* which will exploit the incumbent's greatest strengths and provide real support in those areas where the incumbent has less experience or less interest," said one observer.

The responsibility of the board for a new president does not end with a sigh of relief and a crossing of fingers after selecting the president. Part of the entrance process, to be facilitated by the board, is to encourage the predecessor president to participate in campus affairs only at the invitation of the new president, if at all. Our conversations suggest that although some former presidents are a valuable resource, lingering predecessors and predecessor spouses can increase the burden and difficulty of new presidents. Also, the board and all officers should disengage themselves from any presidential duties they have absorbed during a transitional period.

The new president should very early set priorities on use of time and on major projects to be undertaken; otherwise he or she can quickly and easily become overcommitted. The keeping of a record of how time is actually spent can be very helpful, particularly if subject to periodic review, perhaps with the advice of top personal staff members.

The new president needs to assume leadership smoothly, gracefully, and quickly.

Notes for
Chapter Three

1. For typical compensation and benefits, see *1983/84 Compensation & Benefits Survey of College and University Chief Executive Officers* prepared by Sibson & Company, Inc. (Princeton, N.J.) for the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the College and University Personnel Association, April 1984.

4

Chapter Four

Supporting the President

Supporting the President

"If any man wishes to be humbled and mortified, let him become President of Harvard College."[1]

Edward Holyoke, the eleventh president of Harvard, said that on his deathbed (1769), and some college presidents of today may well echo the sentiment long before reaching their own deathbeds.

The main potential sources for support of a president are family and friends, immediate staff, friendly fellow presidents (particularly any old hands), the faculty, and the board. The role of the board is central. This is especially true because so many faculty members have always looked upon the president as the opposition to be criticized rather than as a protector and supporter to be aided. In recent times this has become true of students as well.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Board support of presidents is crucial but often not given careful consideration. At least once a year (perhaps when the review of officers' compensation is carried out), boards should give formal consideration to their provisions for support of the president and the president's spouse, if any and if active.

Review the conduct of the board. Boards should review themselves to determine if they are creating an effective environment for presidential leadership. Presidents find themselves handicapped, as they have reported to us, if the board is rent by factions, if board members become representatives of external or internal factional interests, if the board is unduly subject to the wishes of one or a few members. Boards have a special responsibility to ensure that new members become effective members. This is easier to do when institutions are private than when they are public; but, even in the latter case, influences such as full orientation by the board chair can often be brought to bear. "If you have a effective board, you have an effective presidency," said one long-time president.

Define the role of the board itself. Many presidents told us they run into difficulties when the board intrudes too far into management. The line between policy making and management is a difficult one to draw but each board should make a determined effort to do so. Basically the board should limit itself (1) to policy—defined as determining the missions of the institution, approving its budget, and setting the guidelines for making individual decisions; (2) to major individual decisions—such as appointment and review of the president; and (3) to monitoring institutional functioning by receiving and discussing reports.

Also, the president should be provided a role of leadership within the board itself, including the development of the agenda and making all important recommendations directly to the board. The role of the board should be more advice and consent than direct action in the areas of management. One president we interviewed thought "the job of president is 25 to 30 pecent more demanding than it should be because of extramural interference from the board of trustees. Too much has to be approved by them."

It is vitally important to draw with some precision the line that divides what the president does from what the board does. Only the chair of the board can effectively police the observance of this line by the president and by individual board members.

We endorse the list of responsibilities to be carried out by a board as identified by John Nason[2] and as they apply variously to different types of institutions:

- to maintain the integrity of the trust;
- to appoint the president;
- to make certain that the institution is well managed;
- to approve the budget;
- to raise money;
- to manage the endowment;
- to ensure adequate physical facilities;
- to oversee the educational program;
- to approve long-range plans;
- to serve as bridge and buffer between campus and community;
- to preserve institutional autonomy;
- to serve as a court of appeal.

The board also provides the long-term continuity of the institution; it spans the years, the presidencies, and the student and faculty generations.

Care for the president. Presidents note, and many complain about, the heavy pressures on their time—including calls from board members who think the president should always be available on the other end of the telephone line. One normally enthusiastic president said, "I often feel lousy after everyone else dumps on me. People come in here, tell me their troubles, and say 'My! I feel much better!' But I feel terrible."

Boards should provide for adequate vacation time and should even insist that vacations be taken. Additionally, we favor mini-sabbaticals of at least an extra month to be taken not less than every third year. The president should, over a period of several years, have as much total vacation and sabbatical time as a member of the faculty on an eleven-month appointment. The circumstances are rare, however, when a president can be absent for more than three months in any one year.

The president (and participating spouse) should be encouraged to take advantage of opportunities for professional development (as part of working time) through travel abroad and attendance at conferences, seminars, and summer training sessions. Attendance at association meetings with other presidents can often be not only an excellent learning experience but also very refreshing as presidents share their problems, and in sharing, lighten their sense of burden.

Presidents have no peers on their own campuses with whom they can talk. Consequently, some presidents around the country have formed their own mutual support groups, sometimes in conjunction with national or regional higher education associations. However, more widespread and systematic opportunities for presidents to get together in small groups would, on the basis of our interviews, provide much needed occasions for presidents to give and receive mutual support. We were told over and over, "No one can really understand this job until he or she is in it." Although institutions and problems are diverse, there are common themes running through the presidency in all kinds of colleges and universities. Presidential roundtables, organized either within or across sectors of higher education, on a regional basis, would be very helpful to presidents in the discussion of specific problems, and would, more generally, help relieve the sense of isolation and loneliness that many now feel.

Board care for the president is particularly important in times of stress and controversy. This is when the president most needs support, especially if the president comes under attack for carrying out board policies—policies that the board itself asked for or agreed to or voted for. Some of the greatest tragedies have occurred when boards have repudiated presidential actions they had either requested or approved in advance.

At all times, board members need to understand the complexities of the presidency and the conflicts that inherently surround the position. The president must choose events to attend, not on the basis of personal taste but on their usefulness to the institution, and must choose which friends of the university to entertain. These difficult tasks of choice need to be recognized by board members; the president (and spouse) cannot be everywhere and with everybody all the time.

Reward the president and the active spouse. Presidents and participating spouses are not primarily motivated by money, otherwise they would not be presidents and participating spouses of educational institutions. But many presidents do complain about the small differential between their salaries and those of other administrative officers and of faculty members. Boards must keep in mind that presidents are limited in their receipt of outside income and must make considerable charitable and other gifts.

A word of encouragement at the end of a board meeting, at a commencement exercise, or after a dinner or other social occasion can go a long way. Many presidents told us that all they hear is criticism. There is no substitute for appreciation expressed to the president and to the active spouse. It is the most valuable coin in this realm.

Encourage faculty support for the president. Faculty can be particularly helpful by creating an effective structure of advisory consulting committees that represent considered faculty opinion across the institution as a whole. These committees should give their advice promptly. An overall advisory committee able to draw together faculty advice quickly and to look at developments very broadly can often be of critical assistance to the president.

Faculty members should be sensitive to the gravity of issues that pit faculty against board and should handle them with considerable discretion. An antagonized board should be risked only in the gravest of situations; presidents can be immobilized by such conflicts.

Faculty members should also be prepared to alert the president to incipient problems. Faculty members' acceptance of the president as a colleague, where such a relationship exists or is arranged, is at least as helpful as board acceptance of the president as a colleague.

Notes for Chapter Four

1. Samuel Eliot Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936, p. 99.
2. John W. Nason, *The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards,* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982, Chapter 3.

5

Chapter Five

Carrying on Reviews

Carrying on Reviews

Presidential reviews are good; they are bad; they are pro forma nonsense. It all depends on the circumstances and the methods.

Periodic presidential review became a common aspect of the presidential career in the late 1960s and the 1970s, and many institutions now have some type of periodic formal or informal review.[1] But presidents have always been under almost constant review: every time they give speeches, every time they report to board meetings, every time they meet with students or alumni, every time they take their seats at sporting events. In this they are like mayors, governors, and the President of the United States. The sense of being under constant review is, for many university presidents, one of the burdens of the position—like living in Macy's window 12 hours a day.

Formally announced and conducted reviews sometimes give the president a chance to showcase accomplishments (here, the reviews can be helpful); or they give the board a chance to start the process of eliminating a president (which is the poorest way to approach this problem); or they provide constituencies an opportunity to be consulted (but this is not necessarily the best method for achieving consultation); or, in still other situations, the reviews amount to little more than going through the motions (which obviously is wasted effort).

Not all persons, not even the president, can always be sure in advance into which category the particular review may fall, and it may fall into more than one category as seen from different points of view. Presidents, we found, like the first type of review, particularly if they can guide it; hate the second; and are amused or annoyed or bored by the third and the fourth.

Here are six primary drawbacks to formally announced and publicly conducted reviews and especially to those conducted under sunshine laws:

1. They give critics a golden opportunity to present their criticisms all at once—even to coalesce in a concerted campaign to burnish every cherished grievance. Such a wave of criticism can harden lines of opposition and cause resentment for a long time to come.

One president analyzed the process of cumulative grievances as follows: "On any issue I'll enjoy an incredibly high 90 to 95 percent of faculty support. Even so, five percent are dissatisfied with my decision, and they remember. On the next issue, I'll again enjoy the same 90 to 95 percent support, but the five to ten percent of dissenters will be a different group, and they, too, will remember. Eventually one manages to make at least one decision against the convictions of virtually every member of the faculty. By recognizing and providing an outlet for such accumulated discontent, the formal evaluation process merely increases the speed by which courageous decision makers are turned over. This does nothing for attracting the best people into the jobs."

2. Formal reviews make it difficult for presidents to reach certain specific decisions for some reasonable time before the review (if their decisions may engender negative reactions), or imminent reviews may entice presidents to save up some decisions (those that might draw potentially favorable reactions) until just in advance of the review period. As a result, the decision-making process obviously is skewed.

3. Formal reviews may by happenstance come at particularly advantageous or disadvantageous times, thus adventitiously affecting the review one way or the other.

4. Formal reviews almost always reduce flexibility of action all around. Once underway, there is no graceful way for a president to withdraw; and, because dismissals are rarely the result of such reviews, the institution may become committed for perhaps another five years.

5. Sunshine reviews can be a devastating weapon of control by unscrupulous system heads against campus heads.

6. Formal sunshine reviews also may unduly invade the rights of privacy of presidents, as the Montana Supreme Court has unanimously ruled.[2] The court also held that the public's interest in maintaining a smoothly running university system was greater than its interest in opening the evaluation process to the press.

Informal reviews carried on by the chair of the board alone or by a small committee of the board—in each case authorized to do so by the full board, or by the head of a system in consultation with the board—are quite a different matter. To be effective, however, they require that the reviewer or reviewers have good contacts with representative members of the various campus constituencies. This is more likely to be the case in small rather than large institutions.

Informal reviews can be helpful in giving presidents independent assessments of their performances, and can be mechanisms for giving good advice. "Feedback can definitely benefit any president," was a commonly expressed view in our interviews. "Evaluation is a tool for improvement; properly structured, evaluation can in fact be very helpful."

Informal evaluation creates an opportunity for the board to encourage the president to grow in skills and knowledge. It also creates an opportunity for the board to undertake a review of the overall governance of the institution, which is one of the board's greatest responsibilities.

The assistance of an experienced and mutually acceptable outsider can sometimes aid the evaluation process.

An informal assessment should be conducted annually but is particularly helpful at the end of the first year (perhaps the review can be directed by the board members of the presidential search committee) and after the second year. The end of the second year seems to be a crucial time for a more intensive review. The president has by then made a budget; put top staff in place; met frequently with faculty, students, alumni, and board members; and demonstrated the degree of administrative talent he or she has in getting things done in the short run.

The one major (and the most important) aspect of performance not yet known by the end of the second year is contributions to the long-run academic quality of the institution as affected by faculty appointments and promotions, by new programs introduced and old programs eliminated, and by guiding visions of the future. This cannot be known, at all fully, for 5 or 10 or even 20 years. Also, the ability to handle an unexpected crisis may not yet be known.

However: Much is known at the end of two years and it seems to be a good time to decide, mutually, whether a long-term duration of the relationship seems likely to be desirable for both parties or, alternatively, if an early termination seems to be more desirable.

At the 7 or 10-year point, another very careful and critical mutual assessment also seems wise, perhaps covering prospects for continuing the relationship for another 5 or 10 years—both the institution and the president may have changed a great deal during this first 7 to 10-year period.

An alternative or a supplement to a review of any sort is an annual or biennial public report. Such a report creates an opportunity for the president to examine the past year or years and to comment upon the next year or longer. It offers a chance for the board to look at developments from a longer range point of view than specific decisions alone make likely. It also offers an opportunity for constituent groups to consider and comment upon the report and the directions of development of the institution. The review of such a report constitutes a review of the president but not one that is done in a direct and personal way.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Although we found that formal reviews have more often done harm than good, we believe that reviews of presidents should be carried out informally and annually, with particular attention to the review at the end of the second year and at the end of the seventh or tenth years. As an alternative or supplement to these reviews, annual or biennial reports should be made by the president on past and prospective developments, and the reports should be made subject to wide commentary.

The intent of effective reviews is to identify obviously weak presidents sooner and then either give them help or replace them faster and to identify strong presidents sooner and then encourage them to stay longer. The end result would be fewer medium-term presidencies and more short-term and, particularly, more long-term presidencies.

Follow academic practice. Faculty members and students are evaluated in ways that do not encourage organized attacks upon them and that do not unduly embarrass the person being evaluated or weaken the person's capacity to perform. The president deserves similar consideration. Sunshine reviews can be very damaging to incumbents and can be major impediments to persuading potential new presidents to accept this position.

Know in advance what process will be followed. Here again faculty members and students know from the beginning when they will be evaluated, by whom, and upon what criteria. The president deserves no less, particularly if the review is to be formal. The president should be involved in developing the approach to the review and should be encouraged to perform a self-evaluation. As one former system head told us, "For evaluation to be effective, it must be against explicitly stated presidential objectives."

Evaluate the total record. The presidency is a complex position that involves relations with many groups and attention to many problems. It is unfair to concentrate alone on one group or on one problem or on one point of time.

Consider substituting presidential reports for reviews. Such reports, subject to discussion by relevant groups, can serve as a review but a review centered on accomplishments and plans in their totality and not on individual events or grievances.

Notes for Chapter Five

1. For an excellent study of the subject, see *Presidential Assessment* by John W. Nason, Washington, D.C.: Association of

Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980 (revised edition 1984). See also "Reviewing Presidential Leadership," by Barry Munitz in Richard T. Ingram *et al.*, *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980, pp. 377-404.

2. *The Missoulian v. Board of Regents of Higher Education*, Supreme Court of the State of Montana, 1984.

6

Chapter Six

Determining the Length of Term and Handling the Exit

Determining the Length of Term and Handling the Exit

Most exits today are not the result of age alone, as they often once were, but of choice by one or both parties. Exits are almost as important as entrances but, while the latter are sometimes well staged, the former are usually improvised. Too often the leaving is rushed and involves more passion than considered thought. We also think there are too many exits. The median duration of a presidential term now appears to be about seven years; in the community colleges, perhaps more like five is common; in few types of institutions does it exceed ten years and in none twenty.

Short terms involve much lost time. It takes at least a year for a president to get established on the job, and the last year of the term is often not fully effective. Thus the years for peak accomplishment are the years in between.

Also, particularly in private residential colleges, alumni do not start coming back until they have been out for ten years and when they do come back they like to be greeted by "their" president.

The higher education community needs some old hands around to give advice, to act as models for newer persons and to become well-recognized spokespersons for the cause of higher education in the region or even nationwide. But most important, the real test of leadership is whether the institution has been strengthened, particularly academically, and this takes time to accomplish. Short-term presidents have neither the opportunity nor the incentive to meet this test.

If presidents are to engage in preparation of their institutions for the long term, they need to expect to be around in the long term. Short terms are one major reason given by current presidents for their lack of interest in long-range planning and preparation.

Longer terms are particularly desirable when the presidency has been weakened in prior times—as a rule of thumb, it can be said that for every year of a previously weakened presidency, it takes a year subsequently to strengthen it. The more secure a president feels, the more willing he or she is to undertake such leadership efforts.

The presidency is not now, with few exceptions, a lifelong career—it is, rather, an episode in a career. We met few presidents below the age of 60 who expected to retire on the job at age 65, let alone 70. Consequently, presidents worry about what comes next. This is particularly true for younger presidents and there seem to be more of them. They are very likely to leave before the age of retirement—"What comes next?" is a common question.

We see no ideal length of term, whether five for a community college president or ten for a private liberal arts college president. It depends so much on the person and the situation of the institution. But we do think that terms have often become shorter than they ideally should be.

Exits, also, are often poorly handled—with bad feeling and with no proper provision for the former incumbent. This affects both the accession of a good successor, as we have noted previously, and the general reputation of the college presidency.

One major test of any board is the duration of the terms of its presidents (and their effectiveness); another is the smoothness of the transition to each next presidency.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Presidential terms now average approximately seven years; this is too short to serve effectively some of the major interests of an institution. Each board should structure the presidential relationship toward a longer term than now typically exists between the president and the institution. This means giving careful attention particularly to the selection of and to the support for the president, but also to conditions that can enhance longer tenure of positions.

Provide a sense of security early. By informal agreement or by contract, it should be understood at the start of each presidency what will happen upon exit—including exit by retirement.

A common agreement now is that a president will have a turnaround year with full pay. Another is to provide the president with a tenured faculty appointment separately financed—easier in a large or multicampus institution than in a small one. Another is to provide generously for early retirement.

Boards also can help presidents with professional assistance for personal financial planning for the future. "Most presidents do not look to their own self-interest," said one president. Another commented, "I try to think twenty years ahead for the college, but personally I live just one day at a time. I have done no personal long-range planning."

Use fair processes. Termination should always be by the full board; and the president should have an opportunity, if he or she so desires, to make a case for retention. If so requested by the president, the faculty should be consulted on involuntary terminations. In any event, the chair or the executive committee or some small group of board members should not be able to take action unilaterally.

Assist with relocation. Presidents, both those leaving voluntarily and those departing involuntarily, can be helped to find new positions through informal means, including the outplacement services of professional personnel firms. Also, presidents who have been encouraged to engage in career development programs along the way may be in a better position to find favorable relocation; presidents who have been allowed or encouraged to engage in off-campus activities, such as membership on business boards, may also enjoy an advantage. Presidents of other institutions ought to be willing to give a helping hand for a year or two to their former colleagues, and some of them now do so most thoughtfully.

Handle the parting with sensitivity. The parting, whoever initiates it, should be handled with dignity and credit should be given where credit is due to both the president and the active spouse. The president should not be treated as a piece of Kleenex to be used and discarded as some boards have done.

A president leaving voluntarily has an obligation to give advance notice of at least six months and should have served the institution long enough to be effective—which means a minimum of five years. Presidents have an obligation to inform their boards when they are seriously involved in a search process for the presidency at another institution.

Make longer terms more acceptable to the incumbent. The board can accomplish this in several ways we have already noted. In particular: by helping to protect the president's time from unnecessary drains; by providing support for a sufficient and highly competent staff in the president's own office; by giving full acknowledgement for tasks well performed; by protecting the president at times of unfair attacks; and by having a sympathetic and helpful chair of the board to work with the president.

7

Chapter Seven

Governing Multicampus Relationships

Governing Multicampus Relationships

More than one-half of all students in the United States are on campuses that are parts of systems, and approximately one-half of all public campuses (but only about five percent of all private campuses) are combined within systems.

Systems add another, and always complicating, layer to governance. Leadership is bifurcated. Along with the head of the system, there usually is the head of the individual campus. (It is to this standard system that we address ourselves mostly. We do not refer at all to multilocation as compared with multicampus institutions.) In the standard case, both heads are ultimately responsible to the same board and both have the same ultimate internal constituencies: the faculties and the students. This causes some difficulties everywhere. The governance of systems is one of the really sore points in American higher education; a few systems seem to exist on the verge of explosion.

We found the greatest difficulties where detailed decision making is highly centralized at the system level and where campus heads are not adequately backed up by the system even when acting in accordance with systemwide policy. The most smoothly running systems are those where operating decisions are highly decentralized and where the system supports the campus leadership so long as it stays within the established policies. Also, small systems (as Iowa with three campuses) and very large systems (as the State University of New York with 64) seem to work better than those in between, and so also do systems with homogeneous rather than heterogeneous constitutent campuses; and it helps to have a great deal of money to spread around.

No system, however, avoids all difficulties—both those inherent in layering and those devised by the participants who are layered. The questions always exist: Is it my campus or our campus? Are you my boss or my colleague?

Some of the trouble is with the participants. Campus heads have a great tendency to ignore the advantages of the system, counting only the costs. The campus head:

- is freer to work with faculty and students on campus problems and is less burdened with servicing the system board (or coordinating council) and external support sources;
- is able to consult with other campus heads and with systemwide personnel on the handling of problems;
- is not generally compelled to compete publicly for funds and students with the heads of the other campuses as happens where no system exists;
- may be protected by the system from retribution when something unpopular happens on the particular campus;
- and, on entry, the campus head and spouse can be greatly aided by the systemwide leadership in working out understandings and in learning the job.

Campus heads, additionally, sometimes do take advantage of the existence of a higher authority by passing on especially difficult problems or by escaping blame for unpopular decisions by directing the blame to higher levels—thus making their political positions on their own campuses easier or even more popular as they become the spokesman for all local hopes and all grievances.

System heads, on the other hand, may try to hold onto too much detailed authority (or more often their second and third levels of management try to), or may delay too long in making decisions, or may seek to compete for local constituency support with the campus heads, or may play one campus head against another.

The possibilities for conflict are manifold. Boards, of course, must worry not only about this extra set of relationships but also must be even more careful to distinguish between their own role in making policy and the temptation to interfere inappropriately in administrative matters.

Board members also may have special historical connections with and a greater current interest in a particular campus, mostly likely the flagship campus or campuses, and must guard against unwarranted favoritism. Alternatively, they may support a politically strong but academically weaker or newer campus (as, for example, in the population center of the state) rather than the older elite flagship campus in a smaller population center. Or boards may support the campus with the strongest athletic program or the one that serves best some external interest or interests—agricultural interests, for example. Equity in treatment can be as difficult as it is essential.

Recommendations
and
Suggestions

Because systemwide structures are potentially fraught with so much conflict, systemwide boards have a special responsibility to see that a proper balance of authority and responsibility exists between the system and campus heads; that systemwide policies are established which will permit operating decisions to be decentralized to the campuses; that the system head supports campus heads when campus heads follow system-

wide policy effectively; that campus heads, in turn, support the welfare of the system as a whole; and that the board itself treats the several campuses in an equitable manner.

Clarify relationships. The systemwide board should insist that the system head and the campus heads have a clear understanding of who does what; this clarification also is necessary for spouses where they exist and are active. Understandings are particularly important where the system office is in the same city as one of the campuses, or even on the campus. This admonition applies not only to administrative and political activities but also, and sometimes particularly, to social activities. One system head reports that when he came on the job he found the board provided two sentences of information on system-campus relationships and two pages on use of state cars. We once again note the University of North Carolina *Code* as a model document[1] and call attention also to the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* of the State University of New York.[2]

There should be a clear understanding that all matters requiring action by the board must be reviewed by and (with only agreed-upon exceptions) presented to the board by the system executive, and that all campus heads should be appointed on the recommendation of the system head.

An illustrative allocation of assignments follows.

At the system level:

- Assess the needs of the state and region for contributions by higher education within the purview of the system.
- Communicate the missions and needs of the system and of its constituent campuses to the public, state legislature, the governor, and state coordinating agencies.

- Secure resources adequate to carry out these missions.
- Allocate resources to campuses in major categorical components, as opposed to line item appropriations. This includes setting salary levels and the general distribution of personnel among ranks.
- Monitor management of resources on the campuses, while providing flexibility for changing and diverse situations. This includes setting up the accounting system and carrying out audits.
- Ensure that campuses have the best possible leadership, taking into account the nature of each campus and the need for cooperation among the campuses and with the system.
- Coordinate long-range planning within the system and assign program responsibilities among the campuses, with the head of the system acting as the chief academic officer of the system.
- Promote and preserve diversity among campuses—of missions, programs, size; approve the missions of each campus and the introduction of all new programs; determine general admissions policies.
- Provide services to campuses where economies of scale exist (purchasing and computerized records, for example), but avoid requiring uniformity for its own sake.

At the campus level:

- Develop academic, personnel, financial, physical, and student admission plans that reflect the unique mission and assigned mission of the campus within the system.
- Articulate the unique and assigned role of the campus to the system management and board, public officials, and the community at large.

- Work in cooperation with the other campuses and the system to secure resources from funding agencies in the state.
- Cultivate local community groups and leaders to provide resources for programs unique to the campus.
- Manage the resources provided to the campus in accordance with plans agreed upon, and be accountable for that stewardship.
- Carry out all necessary activities not reserved for systemwide action.

Consider strategy in selection of executives. Boards must assure themselves that the campus and system executives are willing to work with each other in cooperation rather than in conflict, and boards should make this requirement an aspect of their review of administrative performance at each level. Past experiences are important in indicating whether this cooperation may be forthcoming. For example: Persons who have run their own freestanding campus and have been accustomed to dealing directly with a governing board and, in public institutions, with the legislature and the governor may have difficulty in adjusting to their altered circumstance as a campus head within a system. Or campus heads who have been accustomed to working directly with faculty and students may find it difficult, when they become system heads, to constrain themselves so as not to undercut the position of campus heads.

Potential compatability should be a major factor in choice of executives, and compatability in performance should be made a major part of their evaluation. Boards should make it clear that they will assist in disciplining recalcitrant campus heads who impede the general welfare of the system.

Provide councils of advisers at the campus level. It is usually helpful, where there are several and particularly where there are many campuses, for each campus to have its own advisory council or even a council with some delegated and clearly defined powers to act on identified local campus matters. The campus head then has his or her own council as a source of advice and support.

Delegated matters might include, for example, approval of appointments below the level of campus heads, all matters related to buildings and grounds, and advice in selecting and evaluating the campus head. A useful rule might be that whatever is delegated to the campus is also delegated to the purview of the council.

Some campus heads use the board of the alumni association or of the fund-raising foundation as their de facto councils. It is better for such councils to be sanctioned by the system than to exist essentially outside it.

Care should be taken to ensure that campus councils, however, not be a source of end runs around the chief executive of the system. To prevent this, the systemwide board should appoint some members of the local council, including the chair. Also, such councils should draw widely for their membership and not be confined to local and parochial members.

Keep informed without meddling. Both system heads and members of systemwide boards have the very difficult assignment of keeping informed about campus developments without interfering in campus affairs.

Accentuate the positive aspects of the structure. The board needs to make good use of the special capacities of the system in the selection of campus officials and in the evaluation of their performances. Also, there are values inherent in a system of presenting a united front for support and of providing a differentiation of missions and programs within the system. These are among the advantages of a system, which serve to offset its disadvantages.

Notes for Chapter Seven

1. *The Code.* Board of Governors, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, July 1972.
2. State University of New York, *Policies of the Board of Trustees, [Albany], April 1, 1983.*

8

Chapter Eight

Guiding Public Authority

Guiding Public Authority

Half of all campuses in the United States (and these campuses comprise 80 percent of all students) are under public authority—mostly of the 50 states but also of local governments for many community colleges.

Public authority has become, over the long term, both less and more intrusive—less in the old-fashioned political sense that governors thought they should be able to select and remove university presidents; more in the sense of bureaucratic surveillance and controls, and in the sense of special interest groups becoming involved in governance.

These developments result from basic changes in the American political process. The spoils system is less accepted than it once was, but the bureaucracy is bigger and better trained, and the electorate is more fractionated and aggressive. All this does not gainsay the fact that the states and other public authorities in the United States have been comparatively generous in their financial support of higher education and restrained in their efforts to control it.

The following describe areas in which state and local authorities have weakened the leadership of American colleges and universities:

- Line-item budgeting reduces the ability of a campus or a system to use funds according to its best judgment. Related to this is centralized state control of purchasing and personnel. Postaudit is better than preaudit.
- Even without line-item budgets, staff agents of the state now have so much more specific information about and general

knowledge of higher education that the budget making and reporting process has become much more complex; scrutiny of campus operations between budgets has also increased. One president claimed that there are thirteen different agencies making or second-guessing higher education decisions in his state all the time.

- The constitution of boards and the selection of individual trustees greatly affect the leadership capacity of system and of campus heads. Larger boards (within reasonable limits—for example, a limit at 30 members) generally are better than smaller ones where a few members can more easily dominate. A range of 9 to 19 members (more in private than in public institutions) merits careful consideration.
- Longer terms are better than shorter ones since board members can better learn their responsibilities and are more likely to identify with the overall welfare of the institution. A range of 6 to 12 years seems to be most desirable. Members who have an already demonstrated interest in higher education are better than those who do not. The worst situations are those where the size of the board is small, the terms are short, members are appointed or elected because of their support among special interest groups, elections are by local districts rather than at large, and where all members are selected at once rather than for staggered terms, as for some community colleges.
- Sunshine laws and practices on personnel selection clearly make it more difficult to get the best possible presidential leadership; sunshine laws and practices on personnel review can make it more difficult to retain such leadership and for presidents to perform effectively.
- In a few states and localities, the governor or other state or local officials, as appointed or elected members of boards,

use their positions on institutional boards to advance their political interests, as, for example, in using board meetings as a forum for their political views.

- In a few states, political patronage still affects the appointment and termination of college employees, seldom at the faculty but occasionally still at the administrative and staff levels—at the extreme, even meter maids in parking lots.

At least half of all public colleges and universities are handicapped by one or more (even all) of the conditions just described.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Undue public intrusion still exists in many—perhaps most—states. Public authorities, in relation to public institutions of higher education within their jurisdictions, can be particularly helpful by (1) abandoning line-item budgeting; (2) constituting boards with persons devoted to the long-term welfare of the institutions for which they are responsible; (3) eliminating sunshine rules on selection and evaluation of presidents; (4) keeping partisan politics out of the university—just as the university itself should stay out of partisan politics; and (5) eliminating (where it still exists) political patronage in the selection and retention of staff.

We also suggest that in each state there should be a periodic review, perhaps conducted by the state coordinating council or its equivalent, of what should be subject to public control and what should be subject to institutional control.

We call attention to the "distribution of authority" suggested by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education[1] and outlined as follows:

Public Control	**Institutional Independence**
Governance	
Basic responsibility for law enforcement	
Right to insist on political neutrality of *institutions* of higher education	*Right to refuse oaths not required of all citizens in similar circumstances*
Duty to appoint trustees of public institutions of higher education (or to select them through popular election)	*Right to independent trustees: No ex officio regents with subsequent budgetary authority*
	Right to nonpartisan trustees as recommended by some impartial screening agency, or as confirmed by some branch of the legislature, or both; or as elected by the public
Right to reports and accountability on matters of public interest	
Duty of courts to hear cases alleging denial of general rights of a citizen and of unfair procedures	
Financial and Business Affairs	
Appropriation of public funds on basis of general formulas that reflect quantity and quality of output	*Assignment of all funds to specific purposes*
Postaudit, rather than preaudit, of expenditures, of purchases, of personnel actions	*Freedom to make expenditures within budget, to make purchases, and to take personnel actions subject only to postaudit*

Examination of effective use of resources on a postaudit basis	*Determination of individual work loads and of specific assignments to faculty and staff members*
Standards for accounting practices and postaudit of them	
General level of salaries	*Determination of specific salaries*
Appropriation of public funds for buildings on basis of general formulas for building requirements	*Design of buildings and assignment of space*

Public Control	Institutional Independence
Academic and Intellectual Affairs	
General policies on student admissions:	*Selection of individual students*
Number of places	
Equality of access	
Academic level of general eligibility among types of institutions	
General distribution of students by level of division	
Policies for equal access to employment for women and for members of minority groups	*Academic policies for, and actual selection and promotion of, faculty members*
Policies on differentiation of functions among systems of higher education and on specialization by major fields of endeavor among institutions	*Approval of individual courses and course content*
No right to expect secret research or service from members of institutions of higher education; and no right to prior review before publication of research results; but right to patents where appropriate	*Policies on and administration of research and service activities*

	Determination of grades and issuance of individual degrees
	Selection of academic and administrative leadership
Academic and Intellectual Affairs	
Enforcement of the national Bill of Rights	*Policies on academic freedom*
Policies on size and rate of growth of campuses	*Policies on size and rate of growth of departments and schools and colleges within budgetary limitations*
Establishment of new campuses and other major new endeavors, such as a medical school, and definition of scope	*Academic programs for new campuses and other major new endeavors within general authorization*

Influence But Not Public Control	Institutional Independence
Academic Affairs — Innovation	
Encouragement of innovation through inquiry, recommendation, allocation of special funds, application of general budgetary formulas, starting new institutions	*Development of and detailed planning for innovation*

Notes for Chapter Eight

1. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pp. 25-27.

9

Chapter Nine

Conducting the Presidency

Conducting the Presidency

The presidency, of course, carries great responsibilities, and this section is addressed to current and prospective presidents as they face these responsibilities.

Few presidents can be much better than their boards; none can be much worse—at least not for very long. In the latter case, the board makes a change. In the former case, a potential president is unlikely to accept employment from a truly inadequate board; if the offer is accepted, the president is not likely to stay long.

In most situations, however, the most important continuing constituency for presidents is the board with which the president must deal. The board chooses presidents, evaluates them, and can terminate them. The president's life usually focuses, above all else, on the board. There are exceptions—where, for example, the central relationship of the president is with the faculty as in some academically elite institutions, or with the alumni as in a few older, residential colleges and universities with strong traditions, or with the student market as in many community colleges. Nevertheless, even in these situations, the board is an important presence. The president, however, can make a difference on his or her own, and sometimes a very great difference over and above the possibilities and constraints the board itself initially creates.

Recommendations and Suggestions

Each president has a responsibility for maintaining and/or creating an effective presidency, particularly (but by no means exclusively) in relation to the board.

Conduct a self-assessment. Executive search consultants report that the vast majority of potential candidates for presidencies seem not to have assessed, with any care, their own abilities. Serious candidates (and the boards that consider them) should be concerned with at least the following:

- Do they have the level of physical endurance the job requires?
- Do they have the degree of psychological resiliency that is requisite?
- Do they have a family situation that is compatible with the presidency under consideration?
- Are they willing to live in the midst of ambiguity and conflict?
- Are they willing to inflict and accept personal pain for the sake of progress?
- Do they have the patience for seemingly endless consultations and efforts at persuasion?
- Are they content to associate with many people not of their own choosing? (One president commented, "Hell is an endless cocktail party.")
- Are they willing to live with a changed relationship to faculty members—where friends may become acquaintances, and acquaintances may become critics?

- Do their values, executive style, and abilities fit the specific institution and its current needs?

A very basic rule: Individuals who believe they absolutely must be university presidents (and we are speaking here both of presidential candidates and incumbents) probably should not hold that position, because such a commitment to presidential status—above all other considerations—will result in a loss of the kind of independent judgment and action that the presidency requires.

Examine the institution with care. The two areas where presidents have the least advance information and where they encounter their greatest surprises both involve the board, and we have already noted them. First, they usually do not know the inner workings of the board—who has what influence, who has what special concerns, what are the relations of the board to policy and to operations, among other important matters.

In a second area, they usually also do not know what staff members are untouchable as far as the board or one or more members may be concerned.

Thus presidents often go in at least partially blind about the levels both directly above and below them, and there is almost no place they can turn where they can improve their vision in advance. The big exception is where the new president comes from within the institution and, even then, blind spots can exist. To start off well, each president should seek out and eliminate blind spots.

The surrounding community also needs to be studied carefully. It is noteworthy how many different cultures surround the colleges and universities of America. The president must know and acknowledge these differences. One president told us, "You need a different style for each of your different constituencies, but the message you convey must always be the same."

Set priorities on use of time and endeavors to undertake. It is particularly important, as we have noted previously, for the new president to develop a strategy in the use of time and in the selection of problems to be approached. "The opportunities for leadership are boundless; the time and resources, however, to address the issues are limited," observed a community college president.

Serve the board. The board needs care and feeding by the president, as the president does by the board. Each president needs a strategy in relation to the board. Some elements may include:

- Providing all the information the board may wish and all that it needs—both good and bad news. One president said, "I consider myself to be an educator with respect to the board."
- Making clear recommendations to the board.
- Giving the board advance warning of difficult situations whenever possible.
- Creating opportunities for the board to participate early in the process of making all important policies.
- Helping the board to structure itself effectively and to select (or influence the selection) of new members.
- Developing a close working relationship with the chair of the board and the chairs of committees.
- Never taking the board by surprise. (This was a cardinal rule of most of the successful presidents we interviewed.)
- Creating a record of integrity in working with the board.

The president has many responsibilities in supporting the board: helping to choose effective new members, orienting new members to their responsibilities, providing full information on institutional affairs, making carefully considered recommendations, indicating how the board could be more effective in its operations, making board meetings interesting and rewarding, seeing to it that board members receive appreciation for their efforts. Presidents should periodically review their quality of support for their boards.

Serve the campus. Here the central theme of the most successful presidents is: consultation but no vetoes by special interest groups. Consultation with the faculty is of preeminent importance.

Serve the community. Each college or university has a segmented community attached to it, and service to these segments is inescapable. These segments variously include the alumni, or the church, or the student market, or the political powers in the state and the locality, or an ethnic or racial group, or more likely some combination of these. The basic rule here is: full information to the group but no interference by the group; the essential autonomy of the institution and the academic freedom of its members must be maintained. The president must be willing to say "no" on occasion.

It is particularly important for the president to be a good member of the surrounding community of educational institutions.

Serve the future. The president has the primary responsibility for assessing the likely future and for preparing the campus to meet it. The essence of the presidential task is "to cast a vision of the place," and then "to move to the internalization of the vision" within the college or university community. If there is to be vision, it must come primarily from the president.

Serve society. Presidents should accept greater responsibility for speaking out in a nonpartisan fashion on major social and scientific and technical issues that affect the whole society. Much of the analysis of these issues and the expertise needed to solve social problems comes from institutions of higher education, and their presidents are in a position to bring both knowledge and a sense of values to bear on them. As Teddy Roosevelt once observed, the presidency is, indeed, a "bully pulpit"—and not only in Washington but similarly on each campus. The president can also encourage faculty members to share their expertise with the public. Trustees need to understand and appreciate the value of such contributions by presidents and by faculty members to public knowledge and debate.

Listen to sage advice. From our interviews and from our reading, we captured some advice (given by long-term and successful presidents) that we pass along without necessarily endorsing each item:

- Be lucky[1]—in terms of time and place.
- Don't promise too much in advance.
- But early on provide a vision and a structure for implementing it.
- Spend time with individual board members.
- Walk the campus and listen a lot; the leg is better than a letter for carrying a message.
- Be ready to fight—but only fight for what you are willing to die for.
- You must realize that you are not responsible for all the faults of all others in the institution; and, more important, your board should realize this also.
- Don't give all of your heart to the institution—if you do, you may lose it.

- Never surprise the board.
- Cultivate patience; outsit faculty dissidents who have the rumps of Stalinists.
- If you must tell someone to go to hell, try to help them look forward to the trip.
- Keep the place alive and awake—yourself, too.
- Don't cackle like a hen that's laid an egg every time you achieve something.[2]
- Don't let routine work drive out nonroutine work.[3]
- Remember that, in a college or university, the success of the institution lies in the success of the individuals within it.
- Convince your board members to keep their eyes, ears and minds open—and their hands off.
- It is better to spend your time on recruiting and training staff members than on supervising and dismissing them.
- When your stock is down, don't expect too many friends to step forward.[4]
- Be prepared to lose friends and make enemies.
- Know when not to leave and when to leave; and when you do leave, do not add to the pain of the one who follows.
- Save a little time for laughter along the way.
- Be lucky—in having a good governor or a good chair of the board or both.

In the end, a central reality is that strengthening the board, strengthening the institution, and even strengthening the presidency depends on the president more than on any other element of the higher education community.

Notes for Chapter Nine

1. Herman B Wells, *Being Lucky,* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980. (President Wells, of course, had a great deal more going for him than luck alone.)
2. Abbott Lawrence Lowell, *What a President Has Learned,* New York: Macmillan, 1938, p. 21.
3. Warren Bennis, *The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead,* New York: AMACOM, 1976, p. 20.
4. James L. Fisher, *Power of the Presidency,* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1984, p. 189.

10

Chapter Ten

Concluding Comments

Concluding Comments

Over the past 20 years, the strength of the presidency in most, but by no means all, institutions of higher education (particularly the public institutions) has been weakened.

There are more constraints—as one person said: "More barbed wire around smaller corrals." In particular:

- More federal and state controls.
- More participation by the courts in academic decision making.
- More influence by faculties over appointments and promotions and over academic policy.
- More unionization of faculties.
- More influence by students in campus governance and through the student market.
- More variety in the composition and interests of the student body and other campus constituencies.
- More objectives to be met and more ambiguity of goals.
- More fractionalization of the campus into special interest groups; less consensus; less sense of community.
- More participation by many boards in daily decision making, particularly by those boards that contain representatives of special interest groups.
- More bureaucratization of staff and increased influence by technical experts on campus and off.
- More layers of governance through the impact of systems and of coordinating councils.

- Less chance for institutions to grow and to make changes in the process of growth.
- Less assurance of the importance of the missions of higher education.
- Less acceptance of authority in almost all institutions of American society, including higher education.

These constraints must be accepted as givens and the presidency must be adjusted to them, and some of them are highly desirable on other grounds. But there are areas of remaining flexibility that can and should be explored for the sake of the effective presidency, as we have sought to show in this report.

We strongly support the need for wide consultation and the approach of shared governance in the conduct of colleges and universities. We conclude, however, that in many institutions the share of the president in governance is now too small—too small not only for the sake of the president but also, and particularly, for the sake of each institution; a new balance should be sought, one more appropriate to the new circumstances. Leadership often needs to be strengthened for the sake of:

- The attraction of maximum financial resources to the institution.
- The utilization of available resources to maximize their effectiveness.
- The persuasive representation of the institution to concerned external publics.
- The recruitment and retention of able faculty and staff.
- The dynamic readjustment of the institution to new opportunities in the world of the intellect and in the demand of society for higher skills.

- The initiation of internal educational reform--particularly in the areas of general education for the undergraduates and the improvement of academic quality.
- The preservation and enhancement of institutional diversity.
- The acceptance and integration of new campus constituencies.
- The improvement of the sense of community by enhancing, for example, quality of communications, which is especially important in a time of great uncertainties when the sense of community might deteriorate.
- The resolution of internal conflicts and misunderstandings.
- The reduction of the negative impacts of particularism among the component parts of the institution.
- The defense of the autonomy of the institution and the academic freedom of its members.
- The creation of an overall vision and strategy by each institution for confronting future problems and opportunities.
- The development of institutional leaders who can stand out as regional and national representatives of the needs of higher education, as proponents of the contributions of higher education to society, and as defenders of the faith that the one great good, as Socrates said, is knowledge.

The president accomplishes none of these goals alone but few of them can be reached to the maximum without personal presidential contributions. The central purpose of our many suggestions is to make it more likely, even within the context of the new constraints, that more presidents will be in a better position to make such contributions: that they will have a better chance to lead.

Recommendations and Suggestions

The central role of the presidency to ensure the overall and long-term welfare of institutions of higher education has often unnecessarily and unwisely been diminished. All campus and higher education constituencies should be prepared to reexamine the conditions surrounding the presidential role; each campus (and higher education in its entirety) will suffer if that central role is not performed to full effectiveness.

Strengthening presidential leadership is one of the most urgent concerns on the agenda of higher education in the United States. It makes a great difference who the presidents are and what the conditions are that surround their contributions. The greatest test of a board in the long run is the quality of the presidents it is able to attract and to retain.

Appendices

Appendix A.

The Study

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, under the initiative of its president, Robert L. Gale, appointed a Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership to investigate the condition of the college and university presidency, and to make recommendations for enhancing the presidency. The commission was formally established in February 1982.

Attention to the problem first began in the early 1970s with informal discussion among members of the association at their two meetings each year. These discussions followed on the very great turnover in presidencies during the prior several years and other evidence of discontent of trustees with presidents and of presidents with their positions. The informal conversations, accelerating in frequency and in intensity, gradually led to comments during sessions of the annual meetings and later to discussions within meetings of the board of directors. Eventually, the board concluded that an inquiry geared to recommendations could assess the gravity of the problems and suggest solutions.

AGB has had a long-time and deep interest in the conduct of the presidential role within colleges and universities. Aside from many presentations at annual meetings and articles in *AGB Reports,* AGB has published the following widely used reports:

Presidential Search, by John W. Nason, 1979 (revised edition 1984).

Presidential Assessment, by John W. Nason, 1980 (revised edition 1984)

The role of the president has also been examined in:

The Nature of Trusteeship, by John W. Nason, 1982.

Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, edited by Richard T. Ingram, 1980.

AGB has also published two other reports, closely related to this one, prepared by commissions chaired by former Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina:

Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Private Colleges and Universities, 1980.

Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Public Colleges and Universities, 1980.

We have drawn on these and other studies. Appendix B sets forth a selective list of recent related studies.

Members of the Commission met in small groups and in full sessions on the following dates and in the following locations:

March 18, 1982; Chicago
April 20, 1982, Denver
June 1, 1982; Washington, D.C.
June 3, 1982; Chapel Hill
April 9, 1983; Atlanta
June 17, 1983; Chicago
June 22, 1983; Washington, D.C.
June 23, 1983; New York
June 25, 1983; Cambridge
October 8, 1983; New Orleans
March 31, 1984; San Francisco

Members of the Commission participated in interviews with informed persons to broaden the experience and the points of view available to the Commission in its discussions and in the preparation of this report. A list of interviewees is given in Appendix C with a notation of the person who conducted each interview. Tables indicating the range of interviews conducted are set forth at the end of this appendix. The interviews covered all 50 states, and, one way or another, experiences in at least a thousand institutions.

The Commission made particularly good use of the resources of AGB: 25 of 30 members of the AGB Board, who served while the Commission was active, were interviewed; 23 of 39 AGB board mentors; 28 of 29 members of the AGB presidential advisory council.

Nancy Axelrod, vice president of AGB, served as liaison between the Commission and AGB and was at all times most helpful. We considered her as a most valued member of the Commission itself.

The Carnegie Corporation provided the basic grant which made possible this study, and E. Alden Dunham, program officer, was most helpful in participating in interviews and in giving advice. Assistance also came from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (through the initiative of its president, Ernest L. Boyer) and from the resources of AGB.

David Riesman of Harvard University served as consultant to the project with the assistance of Sharon Elliott Fuller; Marian Gade as assistant to the chair of the Commission; and Maureen Kawaoka as administrative secretary—and all made essential and exceptional contributions.

The Commission expresses its appreciation to AGB for the opportunity to prepare this report but wishes to make clear that the conclusions reached and the recommendations made are those of the Commission and not of AGB. It also expresses its deep appreciation to the many interviewees who were almost invariably extremely frank and helpful. The members of the Commission are briefly identified below by reference to current or past activities of special relevance to this study:

VERNON R. ALDEN, former president of Ohio University, is a trustee of Brown University. In addition to being a member of AGB's Board of Directors, he holds numerous corporate and civic directorships and serves on several visiting committees.

DAVID G. BROWN, chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Asheville, is author of *Leadership Vitality.* He is a past provost and executive vice president of Miami University (Ohio) and president of Kentucky's Transylvania University.

MARGUERITE CORBALLY, author of *The Partners: Sharing the Life of a College President,* lectures widely on the role of wives whose husbands hold public leadership positions. Her career as a president's wife includes posts at Syracuse University and the University of Illinois.

MERRIMON CUNINGGIM, a member of AGB's Board of Directors, was formerly president of The Danforth Foundation and of Salem College (North Carolina), and is consultant to other foundations and colleges. He is now president of the Center for Effective Philanthropy and a trustee of Vanderbilt and Duke universities.

DANIEL J. EVANS is a U.S. senator from Washington state and a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He was president of Evergreen State College (Washington) from 1977-1983, following three terms as governor of the state.

E. K. FRETWELL JR., chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, is a member of the Board of Visitors of Johnson C. Smith University and the AGB Advisory Council of Presidents. Fretwell is a former trustee of Wesleyan University and Canisius College, former president of the SUNY College at Buffalo, and past chair of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and of the American Council on Education.

SISTER ANN IDA GANNON, B.V.M., former president of Chicago's Mundelein College, is a trustee of St. Louis University, Ursuline College, and Catholic Theological Union. She is a board director of AGB, and a former chair of the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, and the Religious Education Association of America.

JANET D. GREENWOOD, president of Longwood College, is the first woman to head a state-assisted, four-year and graduate-level higher education institution in Virginia. Earlier, she was vice provost for student affairs and professor at the University of Cincinnati and held a number of administrative and teaching posts at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

JOSEPH F. KAUFFMAN is the author of *At the Pleasure of the Board: The Service of the College and University President* and *The Selection of College and University Presidents.* A professor of education administration at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a trustee of St. Norbert College (Wisconsin), Kauffman is former executive vice president of the University of Wisconsin System and president of Rhode Island College.

LESLIE KOLTAI is chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District. A former chancellor of the Metropolitan Community Colleges in Kansas City (Missouri), he also taught at the University of Southern California and the University of California. Koltai is a member of AGB's Advisory Council of Presidents and a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

BARRY A. MUNITZ, president of the Federated Development Company in Houston, is former chancellor of the University of Houston central campus, and former academic vice president of the University of Illinois System. Munitz, whose writings include *The Assessment of Institutional Leadership,* serves on numerous educational, civic, and corporate boards.

JOHN W. NASON is former president of Swarthmore and Carleton colleges and a former trustee of Vassar College, Phillips Exeter Academy, and Carleton. Nason is the author of AGB's *The Nature of Trusteeship, Presidential Search,* and *Presidential Assessment.*

MARY LOUISE PETERSEN is former president of the Iowa State Board of Regents and chair of the Iowa Coordinating Council for Postsecondary Education. She is a long-term member of the AGB Board of Directors, currently serving in an honorary capacity, and is also a director of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

ALFREDO G. DE LOS SANTOS, JR. is vice chancellor for educational development of Maricopa Community Colleges in Arizona. He was the founding president of El Paso Community College in Texas and is an adjunct professor of adult and higher education at Arizona State University.

DONNA SHAVLIK directs the American Council on Education's Office of Women in Higher Education, where she administers the National Identification Program to advance women in higher education administration. Earlier, she was associate dean of students at the University of Delaware and assistant dean of women at the University of Kansas.

LEONARD H. O. SPEARMAN is president of Texas Southern University. He is a former U.S. deputy assistant secretary for higher and continuing education and director of student special services and student assistance. Spearman was also a pyschology professor for two decades.

DONALD M. STEWART is president of Georgia's Spelman College and a trustee of Grinnell College (Iowa). He is a former assistant to the president at the University of Pennsylvania and a program officer of the Ford Foundation. Stewart is a member of AGB's Advisory Council of Presidents, a former vice chairman of the American Council on Education, and a former chairman of the Educational Testing Service.

CLARK KERR, director of AGB's Strengthening Presidential Leadership Project, founded the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Berkeley, where he was chancellor from 1952 to 1958. He was president of the University of California from 1958 to 1967 and was named president emeritus in 1974.

Kerr is an honorary AGB director, manager emeritus of Swarthmore College, and a former University of California regent. His many career milestones include the chairmanship of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. An internationally known labor relations expert, Kerr's many books include *The Uses of the University.*

DAVID RIESMAN, special consultant to the Strengthening Presidential Leadership Project, has been Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences at Harvard since 1958, becoming emeritus in 1980. His fields of study encompass law, sociology, anthropology, psychology, the nuclear arms race, and higher education.

Riesman is a fellow of Cowell College of the University of California at Santa Cruz, a trustee of Lewis and Clark College (Oregon) and a member of the advisory boards of Marlboro College (Vermont) and Hampshire College (Massachusetts). His many books include *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism.*

TABLE 1

Interviews Conducted, by Position of Person Interviewed or Consulted

Current president	400
Former president	100
Spouse of current or former president*	128
Trustee	47
Administrator (vice president, provost, etc.)	61
Faculty member	25
Higher education association executive	28
Foundation official	4
State and federal officials, including governors and heads of state coordinating agencies	31
Member of executive search or consulting agency	24
Total:	**848**

*Includes 115 females and 13 males

TABLE 2

Interviews Conducted, by Geographic Region	
Northeast	133
Mid-Atlantic	132
South	145
Midwest	189
Southwest and Mountain States	76
Far West	172
Outside USA	1
Total:	**848**

TABLE 3

Interviews Conducted, by Carnegie Classification of Institutions and by Type of System*

Category	CEOs	Spouses	Other Participants**
Doctoral granting	134	43	62
Comprehensive	120	26	24
Liberal arts	134	38	23
Two-year	70	14	7
Other categories	4	2	0
Two-year systems	12	0	2
Four-year systems	26	5	15
Total:	**500**	**128**	**134**

*We made no attempt to interview persons in the approximately 150 private two-year colleges, nor in the many specialized institutions, such as schools of theology.

**Other participants include vice presidents, provosts, other administrators, trustees, and faculty members.

TABLE 4

Interviews Conducted with CEOs, by Special Type of Institutions*

Type	CEOs
Institutions headed by women	54
Catholic Institutions	35
Evangelical Protestant Institutions**	26
Historically Black Institutions	28
Predominantly Hispanic Institutions	9
Total:	**152**

*Also included in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

**Members of the Christian College Coalition and other institutions with similar characteristics.

Appendix B

Selected List of Recent Related Publications Not Noted in the Text

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Responsibilities and Rights of College Presidents.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1981.

Benezet, Louis T., Joseph Katz, and Frances W. Magnusson. *Style and Substance: Leadership and the College Presidency.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Bennis, Warren. *The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead.* New York: AMACOM, (a division of the American Management Association), 1976.

Brown, David G. *Leadership Vitality: A Workbook for Academic Administrators.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1979.

Carbone, Robert F. *Presidential Passages.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Clodius, Joan E., and Diane Skomars Magrath, eds. *The President's Spouse: Volunteer or Volunteered?* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1984.

Corbally, Marguerite Walker. *The Partners: Sharing the Life of a College President.* Danville, Illinois: Interstate, 1977.

Fisher, James L. *Power of the Presidency.* New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984.

Ingram, Richard T. and Associates. *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Kauffman, Joseph F. *At the Pleasure of the Board.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.

______. "The New College President: Expectations and Realities," *Educational Record,* vol. 58, #2 (Spring 1977): 168.

Lee, Eugene C., and Frank M. Bowen. *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

______. *Managing Multicampus Systems: Effective Administration in an Unsteady State.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Munitz, Barry. "Memo to a Multicampus Trustee . . . From a Flagship CEO," *AGB Reports,* vol. 23, #5 (September/October 1981): 19-24.

Ostar, Roberta H. *Myths and Realities: 1983 Report on the AASCU Presidential Spouses.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1983.

Wood, Miriam M. "Crosscurrents and Undercurrents in the Trustee-President Relationship." *Educational Record,* vol. 65, #1 (Winter 1984): 38-42.

Appendix C.

List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted

The position given for each person as identification is that most relevant to the study, whether the position is a current or a former one. Many interviewees have held, or now hold, other relevant positions. A few small-group discussions (three to four persons) were held, and the participants are listed here, as are members of a faculty advisory group at the University of California, Berkeley. The name of the interviewer is in parentheses. In addition to members of the Commission, the following persons conducted interviews that were used in the study: Nancy Axelrod, Vice President for Programs and Public Policy, Association of Governing Boards; Judith Brissette, Director of Institutional Coordination, Western New England College; Roslyn Stewart Christian, Assistant to the President, Association of Governing Boards; E. Alden Dunham, Program Officer, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Sharon Elliott Fuller, Associate of David Riesman; Marian L. Gade, Program Assistant, AGB Presidential Leadership Project; Richard T. Ingram, Executive Vice President, Association of Governing Boards; Beverly Miller, President, Western New England College; David Riesman, Special Consultant, AGB Presidential Leadership Project; David Turney, Dean, Graduate Studies in Education, Indiana State University.

DAVID ADAMANY, President, Wayne State University, MI (Brown)
CLARK D. AHLBERG, President, Wichita State University, KS (Gade)
PAUL ALCANTRA, President, Porterville College, CA (Gade)
DANIEL G. ALDRICH, Chancellor, University of California, Irvine (Kerr)
BENJAMIN H. ALEXANDER, President, University of the District of Columbia (Brown)
MARY ELLEN ALEXANDER, spouse of Benjamin H. Alexander (Brown)
JOHN DAVID ALEXANDER, JR., President, Pomona College, CA (Kerr)
CATHERINE ALEXANDER, spouse of John David Alexander, Jr. (Kerr)
MERLE F. ALLSHOUSE, President, Bloomfield College, NJ (Gade)
BRUCE ALTON, President, Rocky Mountain College, MT (Gade)
ROSEMARY PARK ANASTOS, President, Barnard College, NY (Kerr)
JOHN H. ANTHONY, President, Portland Community College, OR (Kerr)
JOHN ARAGON, President, New Mexico Highlands University (de los Santos)
WILLIAM ARCENEAUX, Commissioner of Higher Education, Louisiana
    Board of Regents (Gade)
DOMINGO ARECHIGA, President, Laredo Junior College, TX (de los Santos)
JAMES I. ARMSTRONG, President, Middlebury College, VT (Nason)
CAROL ARMSTRONG, spouse of James I. Armstrong (Nason)
ROBERT ARNS, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Vermont (Brown)
ALBERTA ARTHURS, President, Chatham College, PA (Fuller, Stewart)

EDWARD ARTHURS, spouse of Alberta Arthurs (Stewart)
ROSEMARY ASHBY, President, Pine Manor College, MA (Miller)
KENNETH ASHWORTH, Commissioner for Higher Education, TX (Munitz)
STEVEN AST, Department of Executive Search, Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc., CT (Gade)
RICHARD ATKINSON, Chancellor, University of California, San Diego (Kerr)
NORMAN PAUL AUBURN, President, University of Akron, OH (Kerr)
ARTHUR AVILA, President, East Los Angeles College, CA (Kerr)
ROBERT AYRES, Vice Chancellor and President, University of the South, TN (Brown)
ROBERT BAILEY, Trustee, Tusculum College; AGB Board Mentor, TN (Brown)
DAVID K. BAKER, President, Harvey Mudd College, CA (Kerr)
VIVIAN BAKER, spouse of David K. Baker (Kerr)
FREDERICK E. BALDERSTON, Professor of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)
SAM A. BANKS, President, Dickinson College, PA (Kerr)
JAMES S. BARRETT, President, Greensboro College, NC (Gade)
B. A. BARRINGER, President, Brookdale Community College, NJ (Gade)
ERNEST BARTELL, C.S.C., President, Stonehill College, MA (Kerr)
THOMAS A. BARTLETT, Chancellor, University of Alabama (Munitz)
EMMETT W. BASHFUL, Chancellor, Southern University, New Orleans, LA (Kerr)
LOUIS BENDER, Professor, Florida State University (Gade)
LOUIS BENEZET, Professor, State University of New York, Albany (Kerr)
WARREN BENNIS, President, University of Cincinnati, OH (Kerr)
RICHARD BERENDZEN, President, American University, DC (Kerr)
GAIL BERENDZEN, spouse of Richard Berendzen (Kerr)
K. ROALD BERGETHON, President, New England College, NH (Nason)
KATHERINE L. BERGETHON, spouse of K. Roald Bergethon (Nason)
MARY FRANCES BERRY, Vice President, University of Colorado (Kerr)
ROBERT M. BERSI, Chancellor, University of Nevada System (Gade)
NEAL R. BERTE, President, Birmingham Southern College, AL (Gade)
RALPH BESSE, Trustee, Case Western Reserve University, OH (Brown)
ALBERTO BESTEIRO, President, Texas Southmost College (de los Santos)
WILLIAM BIRENBAUM, President, Antioch College, OH (Kerr)
RICHARD E. BJORK, Chancellor, Vermont State Colleges (Gade)
JOAN BJORK, spouse of Richard E. Bjork (Gade)
ELIAS BLAKE, President, Clark College, GA (Kerr)
DONALD BLINKEN, Trustee, State University of New York (Fretwell)
MURRAY BLOCK, Deputy to the Chancellor, State University of New York (Gade)
EDWARD J. BLOUSTEIN, President, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey (Dunham)
DEREK BOK, President, Harvard University, MA (Kerr)
SISSELA BOK, spouse of Derek Bok (Kerr)
LANDRUM BOLLING, President, Earlham College, IN (Kerr)

LIBBY BORTZ, Trustee, Arapahoe Community College, CO; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
FRANK BOWEN, Higher Education Consultant, CA (Gade/Kerr)
HOWARD R. BOWEN, President, University of Iowa (Kerr)
WILLIAM BOWEN, President, Princeton University, NJ (Kerr)
WILLIAM J. BOWEN, Vice Chairman, Heidrick and Struggles, Inc., IL (Kerr)
ALBERT BOWKER, Chancellor, City University of New York (Kerr)
WILLARD BOYD, President, University of Iowa (Petersen)
ERNEST BOYER, Chancellor, The State University of New York (Kerr; Turney)
JOHN BRADEMAS, President, New York University (Kerr)
PAUL E. BRAGDON, President, Reed College, OR (Kerr)
NANCY BRAGDON, spouse of Paul Bragdon (Kerr)
HERMAN R. BRANSON, President, Lincoln University, PA (Kerr)
COROLYNNE BRANSON, spouse of Herman Branson (Kerr)
DANIEL L. BRATTON, President, Kansas Wesleyan College (Gade)
THOMAS BREWER, Chancellor, East Carolina University, NC (Gade)
CARROLL BREWSTER, President, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, NY (Cuninggim)
KINGMAN BREWSTER, President, Yale University, CT (Kerr)
KEITH BRISCOE, President, Buena Vista College, IA (Petersen)
CARMEN BRISCOE, spouse of Keith Briscoe (Petersen)
OSWALD BRONSON, President, Bethune-Cookman College, FL (Gade)
G. WAYNE BROWN, Executive Director, Tennessee Higher Education Commission (Kerr)
JOHN LOTT BROWN, President, University of South Florida (Gade)
CATHARINE BROWN, spouse of John Lott Brown (Gade)
PAULA BROWNLEE, President, Hollins College, VA (Brown; Shavlik)
A. LYNN BRYANT, President, Marycrest College, IA (Gade)
NEIL BUCKLEW, President, University of Montana (Brown)
GENE A. BUDIG, Chancellor, University of Kansas (Gade)
BARBARA K. BUNDY, President, Dominican College of San Rafael, CA (Gade)
STUART M. BUNDY, President, Henry Ford Community College, MI (Gade)
JOHN BUNZEL, President, San Jose State University, CA (Kerr)
JOSEPH C. BURKE, President, State University of New York College at Plattsburgh (Nason)
JOAN BURKE, spouse of Joseph C. Burke (Nason)
LUTHER BURSE, President, Fort Valley State College, GA (Stewart)
WILLIAM BYRON, President, Catholic University of America, DC (Gade)
KENNETH D. CABLE, President, Manhattan Christian College, KS (Gade)
JOHN T. CALDWELL, Chancellor, North Carolina State University, Raleigh (Pretwell)
RONALD CALGAARD, President, Trinity University, TX (Gade)
PATRICK M. CALLAN, Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission (Kerr)
KIM CAMERON, Director, Organizational Studies Program, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, CO (Gade)
COLIN G. CAMPBELL, President, Wesleyan University, CT (Gade)

WILLIAM G. CAPLES, President, Kenyon College, OH (Kerr)
RAUL CARDENAS, President, South Mountain Community College, AZ (de los Santos)
CHARLES CARLSEN, President, Johnson County Community College, KS (Gade)
DONALD J. CARLYON, President, Delta College, MI (Gade)
CONSTANCE M. CARROLL, President, Indian Valley Colleges, CA (Gade)
DANIEL CARROLL, President, Carroll and Associates, MI; AGB Board Mentor (Brown)
JAY CARSEY, President, Charles County Community College, MD (Kerr)
NANCY CARSEY, spouse of Jay Carsey (Gade)
JOHN CASTEEN, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia (Greenwood)
DOUGLASS CATER, President, Washington College, MD (Gade)
LIBBY CATER, spouse of Douglass Cater (Gade)
ANTHONY F. CEDDIA, President, Shippensburg State College, PA (Kerr)
BLANCA CEDEÑO, Trustee, Boricua College, NY; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
ELLEN EARLE CHAFFEE, Senior Associate, Organizational Studies Program, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, CO (Gade; Kerr)
ALEX A. CHAMBERS, Trustee, Stillman College, AL (Christian)
JOHN H. CHANDLER, President, Scripps College, CA (Kerr)
NANCY CHANDLER, spouse of John H. Chandler (Kerr)
JOHN W. CHANDLER, President, Williams College, MA (Fuller)
ROSE M. CHANNING, President, Middlesex County College, NJ (Gade)
FRANCES C. CHAPMAN, Member, Missouri State Coordinating Board for Higher Education; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
J. RICHARD CHASE, President, Wheaton College, IL (Corbally)
MARY CHASE, spouse of J. Richard Chase (Corbally)
JAMES E. CHEEK, President, Howard University, DC (Kerr)
EARL CHEIT, Dean, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)
RICHARD D. CHESHIRE, President, University of Tampa, FL (Gade)
RALPH CHRISTOFFERSON, President, Colorado State University (Brown)
MARTHA CHURCH, President, Hood College, MD (Gade)
DAVID CLARKE, S.J., President, Regis College, CO (Gade)
JAMES CLEARY, President, California State University, Northridge (Koltai)
HARLAN CLEVELAND, President, University of Hawaii (Kerr)
PETER CLIFFORD, President, St. Mary's College, MN (Brown)
ROBERT L. CLODIUS, President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, DC (Kerr)
THOMAS A. COFFEY, President, Thomas More College, KY (Gade)
ARTHUR COHEN, Professor, University of California, Los Angeles (Kerr)
SYBILLE COLBY, Dean, Russell Sage College, NY (Kerr)
JOHN R. COLEMAN, President, Haverford College, PA (Kerr)
DANIEL COLLINS, Trustee, Paine College, GA (Gade)
G. WILLARD COLLINS, President, David Lipscomb College, TN (Brown)

RUTH COLLINS, spouse of G. Willard Collins (Brown)

GEORGE CONGER, President, Aims Community College, CO (Gade)

SISTER SAMUEL CONLAN, President, Dominican College of San Rafael, CA (Gade)

JILL KERR CONWAY, President, Smith College, MA (Miller)

JOHN CONWAY, spouse of Jill Kerr Conway (Brissette)

GEORGE COOK, Trustee, George Mason University, VA; AGB Board Mentor (Gade)

LATTIE F. COOR, President, University of Vermont (Nelson)

GLORIA L. COPELAND, Special Assistant to the President, University of California (Kerr)

JOHN CORBALLY, President, University of Illinois (Kerr)

JOSEPH COSAND, President, Junior College District of St. Louis, MO (Kerr)

KATHLEEN MARIE MILLER COSAND, spouse of Joseph Cosand (Kerr)

ALLISON S. COWLES, Member, Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education, AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)

REX CRAIG, President, Contra Costa Community College, CA (Gade)

JAN CRAIG, spouse of Rex Craig (Gade)

ROBERT CRAIG, Vice President, American Society for Training and Development, DC (Gade)

VERNON CRAWFORD, Chancellor, Georgia Higher Education System (Stewart)

GLENWOOD CREECH, President, Florida Atlantic University (Kerr)

LAWRENCE CREMIN, President, Teacher's College, Columbia University, NY (Kerr)

IVAN C. CROOKSHANKS, President, College of the Sequoias, CA (Gade)

K. PATRICIA CROSS, Professor, Harvard University, MA (Kerr)

MARK H. CURTIS, President, Association of American Colleges, DC (Kerr)

RICHARD CYERT, President, Carnegie-Mellon University, PA (Kerr)

WILLIAM H. DANFORTH, Chancellor, Washington University, MO (Axelrod)

GORDON DAVIES, Director of State Council, Commonwealth of Virginia (Greenwood)

JOHN B. DAVIS, JR., President, Macalester College, MN (Brown)

WILLIAM E. DAVIS, Chancellor, Oregon State System of Higher Education (Gade)

THOMAS B. DAY, President, California State University, San Diego (Koltai)

IRVING E. DAYTON, Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System (Kerr)

RICHARD A. DEBS, spouse of Barbara Knowles Debs, President, Manhattanville College, NY (Kerr)

ANDY DeROCCO, Dean, Trinity College, CT (Kerr)

PETER DIAMANDOPOLOUS, President, Sonoma State University, CA (Kerr)

JOHN A. DiBIAGGIO, President, University of Connecticut (Gade)

CAROLYN DiBIAGGIO, spouse of John A. DiBiaggio (Gade)

ROBERT C. DICKESON, President, University of Northern Colorado (Kerr)

LUDMILLA DICKESON, spouse of Robert C. Dickeson (Kerr)

DAVID W. DICKSON, President, Montclair State College, NJ (Dunham)

BARBARA DICKSON, spouse of David Dickson (Dunham)

RHODA M. DORSEY, President, Goucher College, MD (Fuller)

CALVIN DOUGLAS, Director Executive Recruiting Service, Ketchum, Inc., PA (Kerr)
MARY DOUGLAS, Trustee, Princeton University, NJ; AGB Board Mentor (Gade)
LEWIS C. DOWDY, Chancellor, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University (Kerr)
MATHIAS FRANCIS DOYLE, President, St. Bonaventure University, NY (de los Santos)
GEORGE DRAKE, President, Grinnell College, IA (Kerr)
SUE DRAKE, spouse of George Drake (Kerr)
JOSEPH DUFFEY, Chancellor, University of Massachusetts at Amherst (Kerr)
GLENN S. DUMKE, Chancellor, California State University (Kerr)
POPE A. DUNCAN, President, Stetson University, FL (Gade)
E. T. DUNLAP, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (Kerr)
JOHN DUNLOP, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, MA (Kerr)
JOHN DUNN, President, Professional Personnel Leasing, CA (Kerr)
JOHN W. EASLEY, President, Phillips County Community College, AR (Gade)
JUDITH S. EATON, President, Community College of Philadelphia, PA (Gade)
RUSSELL EDGERTON, Executive Director, American Association for Higher Education, DC (Kerr)
FLORA M. EDWARDS, President, Hostos Community College of The City University of New York (Kerr)
ROBERT H. EDWARDS, President, Carleton College, MN (Fuller; Kerr)
SISTER EILEEN EGAN, President, Spalding College, XY (Kerr)
MELVIN A. EGGERS, Chancellor and President, Syracuse University, NY (Nason)
HAROLD W. EICKHOFF, President, Trenton State College, NY (Dunham)
SISTER JANET EISNER, President, Emmanuel College, MA (Gade)
LLOYD H. ELLIOTT, President, George Washington University, DC (Kerr)
NOLEN ELLISON, President, Cuyahoga Community College, OH (Brown)
PAUL A. ELSNER, Chancellor, Maricopa County Community College District, AZ (Kerr)
ALICE F. EMERSON, President, Wheaton College, MA (Brissette/Miller)
THOMAS EMMET, Assistant to the President, Regis College, CO (Gade)
HAROLD ENARSON, President, Ohio State University (Kerr)
AUDREY ENARSON, spouse of Harold Enarson (Kerr)
CAROL ENOS, Trustee, Rancho Santiago Community District, CA; AGB Board Mentor (Gade)
WILLIAM ERNEST, Professor and Chairman of Educational Administration, University of Montevallo, AL (Gade)
ALVIN EURICH, President, The Academy for Educational Development, NY (Kerr)
NELL EURICH, CEO, New College, FL (Kerr)
HARRY L. EVANS, President, Trinity College, IL (Corbally)
JEAN EVANS, spouse of Harry L. Evans (Corbally)
JOHN EVERETT, President, New School for Social Research, NY (Kerr)
WILLIAM BRUCE EZELL, President, Erskine College, SC (Cuninggim)
EILEEN FARLEY, President, Bristol Community College, MA (Brissette/Miller)

RICHARD E. FELIX, President, Friends University, KS (Gade)
MICHAEL R. FERRARI, Provost, Wright State University, OH (Brown)
JAN FERRARI, spouse of Michael Ferrari (Brown)
STELLE FEUERS, President, Los Angeles City College, CA (Kerr)
MICHAEL FEUERS, spouse of Stelle Feuers (Kerr)
CHARLES FISHER, Department of Council Affairs, American Council on Education, DC (Gade)
JAMES L. FISHER, President, Council for Advancement and Support of Education, DC (Gade)
PETER T. FLAWN, President, University of Texas at Austin (Kerr)
ROBBEN FLEMING, President, University of Michigan (Kerr; Turney)
AUGUSTINE JAMES FLOOD, President, Saint Vincent College, PA (de los Santos)
EDWARD T. FOOTE, II, President, University of Miami, FL (Kerr)
ROBERTA FOOTE, spouse of Edward T. Foote (Kerr)
W. HOWARD FORT, Trustee, University of Akron, OH; AGB Board Mentor (Brown)
PORTER L. FORTUNE, Chancellor, University of Mississippi (Brown)
HARLAN F. FOSS, President, St. Olaf College, MN (Brown)
ED FOSTER, Dean, Whitman College, WA (Kerr)
NORMAN C. FRANCIS, President, Xavier University of Louisiana (Kerr)
CURTISS E. FRANK, Trustee, Colgate University, NY; AGB Board of Directors (Gade)
DAVID WILLIAM FRASER, President, Swarthmore College, PA (Kerr)
BARBARA FRASER, spouse of David William Fraser (Kerr)
CATHERINE FRAZER, Dean, Grinnell College, IA (Kerr)
JOHN FRAZER, Executive Director, Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities (Brown)
WILLIAM C. FRIDAY, President, University of North Carolina (Kerr; Turney)
IDA FRIDAY, spouse of William C. Friday (Kerr)
ROBERT FRIEDMAN, Professor and Chair of Presidential Search Committee, Pennsylvania State University (Kerr)
THEODORE FRIEND, President, Swarthmore College, PA (Kerr)
ELIZABETH FRIEND, spouse of Theodore Friend (Kerr)
THOMAS W. FRYER, JR., Chancellor, Foothill-DeAnza Community College District, CA (Kerr)
GAIL P. FULLERTON, President, San Jose State University, CA (Kerr)
STANLEY FULLERTON, spouse of Gail Fullerton (Kerr)
JAMES FURMAN, Executive Director, Washington State Coordinating Board (Corbally)
ELLEN FUTTER, President, Barnard College, NY (Kerr)
JOHN S. GALBRAITH, Chancellor, University of California, San Diego (Kerr)
PAUL GALLIGER, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Florida International University (Kerr)
SISTER ALICE GALLIN, O.S.U., Executive Director, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, DC (Gade)

PHILIP J. GANNON, President, Lansing Community College, MI (Gade)
DAVID GARDNER, President, University of Utah (Kerr)
JAMES GARDNER, President, Lewis and Clark University, OR (Kerr)
CAROL GARDNER, spouse of James Gardner (Kerr)
JOHN W. GARDNER, President, Carnegie Corporation of New York (Kerr)
FRED GASKIN, President, Moraine Valley Community College, IL (Corbally)
SHELLEY GASKIN, spouse of Fred Gaskin (Corbally)
CHESTER H. GAUSMAN, President, Central Community College, NE (Gade)
E. GORDON GEE, President, West Virginia University (Kerr)
ELIZABETH GEE, spouse of Gordon Gee (Kerr)
WILLIAM GERBERDING, President, University of Washington (Kerr)
RUTH GERBERDING, spouse of William Gerberding (Kerr)
LEIGH GERDINE, President, Webster College, MO (Kerr)
DONALD R. GERTH, President, California State University, Dominguez Hills (Kerr)
RICHARD C. GILMAN, President, Occidental College, CA (Fuller)
ROBERT GIROUX, President, Kansas Newman College (Munitz)
ROBERT J. GLASER, Vice President, Medical Affairs, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)
NORMA GLASGOW, Commissioner for Higher Education, Board of Governors, CT (Kerr)
EDMUND GLEAZER, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, DC (Kerr)
HUGH M. GLOSTER, President, Morehouse College, GA (Kerr)
R. KIRBY GODSEY, President, Mercer University, GA (Gade)
WINFRED L. GODWIN, Executive Director, Southern Regional Education Board, GA (Kerr)
ROBERT F. GOHEEN, President, Princeton University, NJ (Kerr)
PAULA GOLDSMID, Dean, Scripps College, CA (Kerr)
THOMAS GONZALES, President, Linn-Benton Community College, OR (Kerr)
ROBERT C. GOOD, President, Denison University, OH (Kerr)
NANCY L. GOODWIN, President, Arapahoe Community College, CO (Kerr)
MILTON A. GORDON, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, Chicago State University, IL (Kerr)
WYTZE GORTER, Vice President, University of Hawaii (Kerr)
CHARLES J. GRAHAM, President, Hamline University, MN (Brown)
BONNIE GRAHAM, spouse of Charles Graham (Brown)
PATRICIA GRAHAM, Dean, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, MA (Gade)
DALE GRAMLEY, President, Salem College, NC (Cuninggim)
HANNA HOLBORN GRAY, President, University of Chicago, IL (Kerr)
PAUL GRAY, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kerr)
JOHN L. GREEN, President, Washburn University of Topeka, KS (Gade)
MADELEINE F. GREEN, Director, Center for Leadership Development and Academic Administration, American Council on Education, DC (Gade)
ROBERT L. GREEN, President, University of the District of Columbia (Kerr)
WILLIAM GREEN, Acting President, George Fox College, OR (Kerr)

WILLIAM GREENE, President, Livingstone College, NC (Cuninggim)
RICHARD K. GREENFIELD, Chancellor, St. Louis Community College, MO (Axelrod)
VARTAN GREGORIAN, Provost, University of Pennsylvania (Kerr)
ARTHUR B. GROBMAN, Chancellor, University of Missouri — St. Louis (Kerr)
HULDA GROSS GROBMAN, spouse of Arthur B. Grobman (Kerr)
RICHARD F. GROSS, President, Gordon College, MA (Alden)
THEODORE L. GROSS, Provost, Pennsylvania State University, Capitol Campus (Kerr)
ALFRED J. GUILLAUME, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, Xavier University of Louisiana (Kerr)
ARMAND PIERRE GUILLERMIN, President, Liberty Baptist College, VA (de los Santos)
CLAIRE GUTHRIE, Acting President, Chatham College, PA (Axelrod)
NORMAN HACKERMAN, President, Rice University, TX (Turney)
SHELDON F. HACKNEY, President, University of Pennsylvania (Kerr)
LUCY HACKNEY, spouse of Sheldon F. Hackney (Kerr)
RICHARD H. HAGEMEYER, President, Central Piedmont Community College, NC (Fretwell)
ARVIN HAHN, President, Bethany College, KS (Gade)
EDWARD E. HALES, Trustee, Ripon College, WI; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
JOHNETTA R. HALEY, Trustee, Lincoln University, MO; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
WALLACE W. HALL, President, West Valley Colleges, CA (Kerr)
CARL H. HAMILTON, Provost, Oral Roberts University, OK (Gade)
EDWARD HAMILTON, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Manhattan College, NY (Kerr)
MARTINE F. HAMMOND, Professor, University of Kansas (Gade)
JAMES HAMMONS, Professor of Education, University of Arkansas (Gade)
EVELYN HANDLER, President, University of New Hampshire (Nason)
EUGENE HANDLER, spouse of Evelyn Handler (Kerr)
JOHN HANNAH, President, Michigan State University (Brown)
ARTHUR G. HANSEN, Chancellor, Texas A&M University (Kerr)
FRED F. HARCLEROAD, President, Hayward State University, CA (Kerr)
GEORGE M. HARMON, President, Millsaps College, MS (Riesman)
WILLIAM HARRIS, President, Paine College, GA (Gade; Stewart)
MYRNA HARRISON, President, Rio Soledo College, AZ (Kerr)
WILLIAM R. HAUSMAN, President, North Park College, IL (Corbally)
ROSE HAUSMAN, spouse of William Hausman (Corbally)
GARRY D. HAYS, Chancellor, Minnesota State College and University System (Ingram)
FR. TIMOTHY HEALY, President, Georgetown University, DC (Kerr)
ALEXANDER HEARD, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University, TN (Kerr; Turney)
THOMAS HEARN, President, Wake Forest University, NC (Cuninggim)
FRED HECHINGER, President, The New York Times Company Foundation, NY (Kerr)
HARLAN L. HEGLAR, President, Laramie County Community College, WY (Gade)
A. BLAIR HELMAN, President, Manchester College, IN (Corbally)

DAVID HENRY, President, University of Illinois (Corbally)
EDWARD L. HENRY, President, Saint Michael's College, VT (Nason)
MILDRED M. HENRY, Co-president, New College of California (Gade)
FR. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, President, University of Notre Dame, IN (Kerr)
ROBERT L. HESS, President, Brooklyn College of The City University of New York (Kerr)
JAMES HESTER, President, New York University (Nason)
IRA MICHAEL HEYMAN, Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley (Kerr)
ROGER HEYNS, Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley (Kerr)
ESTHER HEYNS, spouse of Roger Heyns (Kerr)
IVAN HINDERAKER, Chancellor, University of California, Riverside (Kerr)
JAMES HINSON, President, Tallahassee Community College, FL (Gade)
CHARLES J. HITCH, President, University of California (Kerr)
D. RAY HOESTETTER, President, Messiah College, PA (Kerr)
PAUL W. HOFFMAN, President, McPherson College, KS (Gade)
THEODORE HOLLANDER, Chancellor of Higher Education, State of New Jersey (Dunham)
HARRIET HOLLANDER, spouse of Theodore Hollander (Dunham)
ANDREW HOLT, President, University of Tennessee (Turney)
MICHAEL HOOKER, President, Bennington College, VT (Gade)
CARL HORN, Chairman, State Community College System of North Carolina (Fretwell)
FRANCIS H. HORN, President, University of Rhode Island (Kerr)
STEVEN HORN, President, California State University, Long Beach (Kerr)
JOHN HORNER, President, Hanover College, IN (Corbally)
ANNE HORNER, spouse of John Horner (Corbally)
THOMAS R. HORTON, President, American Management Association, NY; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
RONALD J. HORVATH, Director, Jefferson Community College, KY (Kerr)
G. W. HOWARD, III, Trustee, University of Illinois (Corbally)
KAYE HOWE, Vice-Chancellor, Academic Services, University of Colorado, Boulder (Kerr)
HAROLD HOWE, II, U.S. Commissioner of Education (Kerr)
JERRY HUDSON, President, Willamette University, OR (Kerr)
ROBERT A. HUFF, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Regents; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Kerr)
EUGENE M. HUGHES, President, Northern Arizona University (de los Santos)
FRED HUMPHRIES, President, Tennessee State University (Brown)
STANLEY IKENBERRY, President, University of Illinois (Corbally)
JUDY IKENBERRY, spouse of Stanley Ikenberry (Corbally)
ALICE ILCHMAN, President, Sarah Lawrence University, NY (Kerr)
WARREN ILCHMAN, spouse of Alice Ilchman (Kerr)
ELMER E. JAGOW, President, Hiram College, OH (Brown)
ELLEN JAGOW, spouse of Elmer E. Jagow (Brown)
PATRICIA JAMES, Trustee, Ohio State University; AGB Board Mentor (Brown)

GEORGE JANIK, Trustee, Kent State University, OH; AGB Board Mentor (Brown)
VERNON E. JANZEN, President, Tabor College, KS (Gade)
JAMES JARRETT, President, Western Washington University (Kerr)
EDWARD H. JENNINGS, President, Ohio State University (Brown)
MARY ELEANOR JENNINGS, spouse of Edward H. Jennings (Brown)
ROBERT JENSEN, President, American River College, CA (Gade)
JOHN JOHNS, President, Furman Univeristy, SC (Cuninggim)
B. LAMAR JOHNSON, Professor of Education, University of California, Los Angeles (Kerr)
DAVID F. JOHNSON, Trustee, Morgan State University, MD; AGB Board of Directors (Gade)
GEORGE W. JOHNSON, President, George Mason University, VA (Gade)
JOANNE JOHNSON, spouse of George W. Johnson (Gade)
HOWARD W. JOHNSON, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kerr)
J. TERENCE JOHNSON, President, Oklahoma Christian College (Kerr)
MARTHA JOHNSON, spouse of J. Terence Johnson (Kerr)
ROBERT R. JONES, III, President, Bob Jones University, SC (Stewart)
JOHN JORDAN, Chairman of the Board of Governors, University of North Carolina (Fretwell)
JOHN KAMERICK, President, University of Northern Iowa (Petersen; Turney)
CHARLES A. KANE, Superintendent/President, Riverside City College, CA (de los Santos)
SHEILA KAPLAN, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Minnesota State System (Gade)
DONALD J. KEEFE, Vice President, Fleming and Associates, KY (Brown)
FRANK L. KEEGAN, President, Salem State College, MA (Kerr)
JOHN G. KEMENY, President, Dartmouth College, NH (Nason)
DONALD KENNEDY, President, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)
JEANNE KENNEDY, spouse of Donald Kennedy (Kerr)
NANNERL O. KEOHANE, President, Wellesley College, MA (Kerr)
ROBERT KEOHANE, spouse of Nannerl Keohane (Kerr)
FRANCIS J. KERINS, President, Carroll College, MT (Gade)
MARY KERINS, spouse of Frank Kerins (Gade)
JAMES KILLIAN, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kerr)
JAMES KILLORIN, Trustee, Albuquerque University, NM; AGB Board Mentor (Gade)
REATHA CLARK KING, President, Metropolitan State University, MN (Brown)
GORDON J. KINGSLEY, President, William Jewell College, MO (Gade)
FRANCES KINNE, President, Jacksonville University, FL (Gade)
WILLIAM A. KINNISON, President, Wittenberg University, OH; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Brown)
BARBARA KLEMME, Assistant to the President, Macalester College, MN (Brown)
DAVID C. KNAPP, President, University of Massachusetts (Alden)
ASA KNOWLES, President, Northeastern University, MA (Kerr)
HENRY KOFFLER, President, University of Arizona (Kerr)

JEROME KOHLBERG, Trustee, Swarthmore College, PA (Kerr)

JUANITA M. KREPS, Vice President, Duke University, NC (Kerr)

WILLIAM W. LAHEY, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, California State University (Gade)

WILLIAM J. LAIDLAW, President, Whatcom Community College, WA (Kerr)

MARGARET LAIDLAW, spouse of William J. Laidlaw (Kerr)

FREDERICK S. LANE, Chairman, Department of Public Administration, Bernard M. Baruch College of the City University of New York (Kerr)

JAMES LANEY, President, Emory University, GA (Kerr)

BERTA LANEY, spouse of James Laney (Kerr)

EUGENE LANG, Trustee, Swarthmore College, PA (Kerr)

NOAH LANGDALE, JR., President, Georgia State University (Kerr)

DAVID M. LASCELL, Trustee, Wells College, NY; AGB Board of Directors (Nason)

HUGH A. LATIMER, President, West Virginia Wesleyan College (Kerr)

ALICE LATIMER, spouse of Hugh A. Latimer (Kerr)

JAMES R. LAWSON, President, Fisk University, TN (Kerr)

EARL LAZERSON, President, Southern Illinois University, Evansville (Kerr)

ANN LAZERSON, spouse of Earl Lazerson (Kerr)

R. JAN LeCROY, President, Dallas County Community College District, TX; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (de los Santos)

EUGENE C. LEE, Director, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)

MARY LEE, President, Los Angeles Valley College, CA (Kerr)

WILLIAM (PETE) LEE, spouse of Mary Lee (Kerr)

CHARLES LeMAITRE, President, University of Texas (Munitz)

J. PAUL LEONARD, President, San Francisco State University, CA (Kerr)

JOHNNIE LEONARD, spouse of J. Paul Leonard (Kerr)

WALTER J. LEONARD, President, Fisk University, TN (Brown)

JOE LEONE, Chancellor, State Regents for Higher Education, OK (Kerr)

JOAB LESESNE, President, Wofford College, SC (Cuninggim)

DAVID LeSHANA, President, Seattle Pacific University, WA (Kerr)

REBECCA LeSHANA, spouse of David LeShana (Kerr)

VIRGINIA L. LESTER, President, Mary Baldwin College, VA (Fuller)

ARTHUR LEVINE, President, Bradford College, MA (Gade; Kerr)

LINDA FENTIMAN, spouse of Arthur Levine (Gade)

ROBERT L. LEWIS, Trustee, Lake Erie College, OH; AGB Board of Directors (Gade)

GARDNER LINDZEY, Director, Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)

SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)

ROBERT P. LISENSKY, President, Willamette University, OR (Gade)

THOMAS LITZENBURG, President, Salem College, NC (Cuninggim)

HERBERT E. LONGENECKER, President, Tulane University, LA (Kerr)
REV. JOHN J. LoSCHIAVO, President, University of San Francisco, CA (Kerr)
AUBREY K. LUCAS, President, University of Southern Mississippi (Brown)
ELLA LUCAS, spouse of Aubrey K. Lucas (Brown)
CARL H. LUNDQUIST, President, Bethel College, MN (Kerr)
RICHARD LYMAN, President, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)
E. WILSON LYON, President, Pomona College, CA (Kerr)
CAROLYN LYON, spouse of E. Wilson Lyon (Kerr)
LINDA LOPEZ McALISTER, Campus Dean, University of South Florida, Fort Myers Branch (Gade)
HAROLD D. McANINCH, President, College of DuPage, IL (Gade)
GUY T. McBRIDE, President, Colorado School of Mines (Kerr)
ROBERT McCABE, President, Miami-Dade Community College, FL (Kerr)
STANLEY E. McCAFFREY, President, University of the Pacific, CA (Kerr)
PATRICK McCARTHY, Chancellor, University of Maine System (Ingram)
MICHAEL MACCOBY, author and consultant, DC (Gade)
JAMES D. McCOMAS, President, Mississippi State University (Brown)
T. R. McCONNELL, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, NY (Kerr)
MILLINGTON F. McCOY, Gould & McCoy, NY (Kerr)
ELLIS S. McCUNE, President, California State University, Hayward (Kerr)
PETER R. MacDOUGALL, Superintendent/President, Santa Barbara Community College District, CA (Koltai)
EARL McGRATH, U.S. Commissioner of Education (Gade)
DEAN McHENRY, Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz (Kerr)
JANE S. McHENRY, spouse of Dean McHenry (Kerr)
RAY MACK, Provost, Northwestern University, IL (Corbally)
ANNE MACK, spouse of Ray Mack (Corbally)
CECIL MACKEY, President, Michigan State University (Brown)
CLARE MACKEY, spouse of Cecil Mackey (Brown)
COOPER R. MACKIN, Acting Chancellor, University of New Orleans, LA (Kerr)
DAVID H. McLAUGHLIN, President, Dartmouth College, NH (Nason)
JUDITH ANN L. McLAUGHLIN, spouse of David H. McLaughlin (Nason)
MARY PATTERSON McPHERSON, President, Bryn Mawr College, PA (Fuller; Turney)
GIBB MADSEN, President, Hartnell College, CA (Gade)
BETH MADSEN, spouse of Gibb Madsen (Gade)
C. PETER MAGRATH, President, University of Minnesota (Kerr)
DIANE SKOMARS MAGRATH, spouse of C. Peter Magrath (Kerr)
JOHN DAVID MAGUIRE, President, Claremont University Center and Graduate School, CA (Kerr)
LILLIAN MAGUIRE, spouse of John David Maguire (Kerr)
NEAL MALICKY, President, Baldwin-Wallace College, OH (Brown)

S. JAMES MANILLA, President, Pima Community College, AZ (Kerr)

WILLIAM J. MANN, Chancellor, Metropolitan Community Colleges, MO (Gade)

CHARLES MANNING, Acting Executive Director, Higher Education Commission, State of Colorado (Gade)

ROBERT MARSTON, President, University of Florida (Gade)

ANN MARSTON, spouse of Robert Marston (Gade)

WARREN BRYAN MARTIN, Scholar in Residence and Senior Program Officer, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, NJ (Kerr)

SEBASTIAN MARTORANA, Professor of Higher Education and Research, Pennsylvania State University (Kerr)

DAVID MATHEWS, President, University of Alabama (Brown)

LEON MAYHEW, Vice Chancellor, University of California, Davis (Gade)

LEWIS MAYHEW, Professor of Education, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)

BENJAMIN MAYS, President, Morehouse College, GA (Kerr)

WILLIAM MEARDY, Executive Director, Association of Community College Trustees, VA (Gade)

MARY-LINDA MERRIAM, President, Wilson College, PA (Kerr)

BARBARA MERTES, Dean of the Campus, Valley Campus of Chabot College, CA; spouse of David Mertes (Gade)

DAVID MERTES, Chancellor, Los Rios Community College District, CA (Gade)

WALTER P. METZGER, Professor, Department of History, Columbia University, NY (Kerr)

MARTIN MEYERSON, President, University of Pennsylvania (Kerr)

BERYL B. MILBURN, Regent, University of Texas System; AGB Board of Directors (Munitz)

BEVERLY W. MILLER, President, Western New England College, MA (Nason)

JOHN MILLETT, Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents (Brown; Gade)

JAMES R. MINGLE, Executive Secretary, State Higher Education Executive Officers, CO (Kerr)

LUNA ISAAC MISHOE, President, Delaware State University (Gade)

REV. J. DONALD MONAN, S.J., President, Boston College, MA (Alden)

WILLIAM J. MOORE, President, Chabot College, CA (Gade)

PEGGY MOORE, spouse of William J. Moore (Gade)

RICHARD MORRILL, President, Center College, KY (Cuninggim)

LLOYD N. MORRISETT, Trustee, Oberlin College, OH (Kerr)

EDWARD J. MORTOLA, President, Pace University, NY (Dunham)

DORIS MORTOLA, spouse of Edward J. Mortola (Dunham)

EMIL MRAK, Chancellor, University of California, Davis (Kerr)

VERA MRAK, spouse of Emil Mrak (Kerr)

STEVEN MULLER, President, Johns Hopkins University, MD (Kerr)

PAIGE E. MULHOLLAN, Provost, Arizona State University (Munitz)

DONALD C. MUNDINGER, President, Illinois College (Corbally)

JUNE MUNDINGER, spouse of Donald Mundinger (Corbally)

THEODORE I. MURGUIA, President, San Jose City College, CA (Kerr)

JANET MURPHY, President, Lyndon State College, VT (Gade)
MSGR. JOHN F. MURPHY, President, Thomas More College, KY (Brown)
TERRENCE J. MURPHY, President, College of St. Thomas, MN (Brown)
JOHN P. MURRY, President, Marymount College of Kansas (Gade)
GUNDER A. MYRAN, President, Washtenaw Community College, MI (Gade)
SAMUEL M. NABRIT, Trustee, Benedict College, SC (Gade)
CAESAR NAPLES, Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, California State University (Gade)
CHARLES A. NELSON, Executive Search Consultant, NY (Gade)
RUSSELL J. NELSON, President, Arizona State University (Kerr)
WILLIAM C. NELSEN, President, Augustana College, SD (Gade)
FREDERIC W. NESS, Director, Presidential Search and Assessment Service, DC (Kerr; Gade)
REV. DONALD S. NESTI, President, Duquesne University, PA (Kerr)
BARBARA NEWELL, Chancellor, Florida State University System (Gade)
FRANK NEWMAN, President, University of Rhode Island (Kerr; Turney)
LIONEL H. NEWSOM, President, Central State University, OH (Kerr)
QUIGG NEWTON, President, University of Colorado (Gade)
JOHN H. NIEMEYER, President, Bank Street College of Education, NY (Kerr)
LEWIS NOBLES, President, Mississippi College (Brown)
DONALD J. NOLAN, Deputy Commissioner, Board of Regents, University of the State of New York (Kerr)
GENE NORDBY, Chancellor, University of Colorado, Denver (Gade)
MARY M. NORMAN, President, Orange County Community College, NY (Gade)
GAIL NORRIS, Associate Commissioner for Budget and Finance, State Board of Regents, UT (Kerr)
EWALD B. NYQUIST, Vice President for Academic Development, Pace University, NY (Kerr)
TERENCE O'BANION, Executive Director, League for Innovation in the Community Colleges, CA (Gade)
THOMAS E. O'CONNELL, President, Bellevue Community College, WA (Kerr)
CHARLES ODEGAARD, President, University of Washington (Kerr; Turney)
FR. THOMAS ODDO, President, University of Portland, OR (Kerr)
DONALD O'DOWD, President, University of Alaska System (Riesman)
JAN O'DOWD, spouse of Donald O'Dowd (Riesman)
BERNARD O'KELLY, Dean, University of Notre Dame, IN (Kerr)
PAUL OLAM, President, University of Oregon (Kerr)
SR. JEANNE O'LAUGHLIN, President, Barry College, FL (Kerr)
MARIAN O. OLDHAM, Curator, University of Missouri; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
GLENN A. OLDS, President, Alaska Pacific University (Kerr)
EVA OLDS, spouse of Glenn A. Olds (Kerr)
PAUL OLSCAMP, President, Bowling Green University, OH (Corbally)
TIM O'MEARA, Provost, University of Notre Dame, IN (Brown)
ROBERT M. O'NEIL, President, University of Wisconsin System (Kerr)

KAREN O'NEIL, spouse of Robert M. O'Neil (Kerr)

KENNETH ORR, President, Presbyterian College, SC (Cuninggim)

ROBERT D. ORR, Governor, State of Indiana (Petwell)

JOSEPH L. ORZE, President, Northwestern State University of Louisiana (Gade)

ALLAN W. OSTAR, President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, DC (Kerr)

JOHN W. OSWALD, President, The Pennsylvania State University (Kerr)

ROSE OSWALD, spouse of John W. Oswald (Kerr)

VINCENT PADILLA, President, Cosumnes River College, CA (Gade)

JOYCE PADILLA, spouse of Vincent Padilla (Gade)

JOSEPH C. PALAMOUNTAIN, JR., President, Skidmore College, NY (Alden)

ROBERT E. PARILLA, President, Montgomery College, MD (Gade)

RODERIC PARK, Vice Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley (Kerr)

ROBERT PARKS, President, Iowa State University (Petersen)

DALE PARNELL, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, DC (Kerr)

SR. GERTRUDE PATCH, President, Lone Mountain College, CA (Gade)

BENJAMIN F. PAYTON, President, Tuskegee Institute, AL (Kerr)

ROBERT L. PAYTON, President, Hofstra University, NY (Kerr)

PAUL PEARSON, President, Miami University, OH (Brown)

GEORGE PECK, Search consultant, Canney, Bowen, Inc., NY (Kerr)

ROBERT PECK, Vice President for Campus Services, Council of Independent Colleges, DC (Gade; Kerr)

JACK PELTASON, President, American Council on Education, DC (Kerr)

MARY PENDLE, Thompson, Pendle Associates, VA (Gade)

JOHN A. PEOPLES, JR., President, Jackson State University, MS (Gade; Turney)

JAMES PERKINS, President, Cornell University, NY (Kerr)

DANIEL H. PERLMAN, President, Suffolk University, MA (Riesman)

CHARLES PERRY, President, Florida International University (Greenwood)

EUGENE V. PETRICK, President, Bellarmine College, KY (Kerr)

HELEN PETRICK, spouse of Eugene V. Petrick (Kerr)

JOSEPH PETTIT, President, Georgia Institute of Technology (Kerr)

ROBERT D. PHEMISTER, Acting President, Colorado State University (Gade)

JOHN D. PHILLIPS, President, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, DC (Kerr)

ALAN PIFER, President, Carnegie Corporation of New York (Kerr)

JOSEPH PLATT, President, Claremont University Center, CA (Kerr)

JEAN PLATT, spouse of Joseph Platt (Kerr)

JOHN W. POCOCK, Trustee, College of Wooster, OH; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)

JEROME M. POLLACK, President, Fairleigh-Dickinson University, NJ (Dunham)

RUTH POLLACK, spouse of Jerome M. Pollack (Dunham)

HELEN POPOVICH, President, Florida Atlantic University (Gade)

EARL PORTER, Secretary, Board of Trustees, University of Illinois (Corbally)

WESLEY W. POSVAR, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, PA (Kerr)

MILDRED M. POSVAR, spouse of Wesley W. Posvar (Kerr)

BRUCE POULTON, Chancellor, North Carolina State University (Brown)

MARGARET R. PRESKA, President, Mankato State University, MN (Brown; Gade)

DANIEL PRESKA, spouse of Margaret R. Preska (Gade)

BILL J. PRIEST, President, Dallas County Community College, TX (Kerr)

ROSS PRITCHARD, President, University of Denver, CO (Kerr)

EMILY PRITCHARD, spouse of Ross Pritchard (Kerr)

JOHN J. PRUIS, President, Ball State University, IN (Corbally)

ANGELINE PRUIS, spouse of John J. Pruis (Corbally)

JOE PUSATERI, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, University of South Dakota (Kerr)

NATHAN PUSEY, President, Harvard University, MA (Kerr)

ANN PUSEY, spouse of Nathan Pusey (Kerr)

KENNETH A. PYE, Chancellor, Duke University, NC (Kerr)

GARY QUEHL, Executive Director, Council of Independent Colleges, DC (Gade/Kerr)

LOUIS RABINEAU, Director, Inservice Education Program, State Higher Education Executive Officers, CO (Kerr)

JANE HAYES RADER, Trustee, University of Illinois (Corbally)

GEORGE RAINSFORD, President, Kalamazoo College, MI (Kerr)

ROBERT D. RAY, Governor, State of Iowa (Petersen)

WENDELL G. RAYBURN, President, Savannah State College, GA (Stewart)

SR. JOEL READ, President, Alverno College, WI (Gannon)

REV. PAUL C. REINERT, Chancellor, St. Louis University, Main Campus, MO (Kerr)

DONALD REUTERSHAN, Chairman of the Board, Skidmore College, NY (Nason)

REV. WILLIAM J. REWAK, President, University of Santa Clara, CA (Kerr)

W. ANN REYNOLDS, Chancellor, California State University (Kerr)

FRANK RHODES, President, Cornell University, NY (Kerr)

LOIS RICE, Vice President, The College Board, DC (Kerr)

JOHN A. RICHARDSON, Commissioner, Board of Higher Education, ND (Kerr)

R. WAYNE RICHEY, Executive Secretary, Iowa Board of Regents (Petersen)

SUZANNE RICHTER, Dean of Instruction, New World College, Miami-Dade Community College, FL (Kerr)

GRESHAM RILEY, President, Colorado College (Kerr)

PAMELA RILEY, spouse of Gresham Riley (Kerr)

TOMAS RIVERA, Chancellor, University of California, Riverside (Kerr)

CHARLES ROBB, Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia (Fretwell)

ALAN J. ROBERTSON, President, Santa Fe Community College, FL (Gade)

PIEDAD ROBERTSON, Vice President of Public Affairs, Miami-Dade Community College, FL (Kerr)

DAVID G. ROBINSON, President, Edison Community College, FL (Gade)

DAVID Z. ROBINSON, Executive Vice President, Carnegie Corporation of New York (Kerr)
OLIN C. ROBISON, President, Middlebury College, VT (Nason)
SYLVIA ROBISON, spouse of Olin C. Robison (Nason)
WILLIAM R. ROGERS, President, Guilford College, NC (Cuninggim)
PAUL F. ROMBERG, President, San Francisco State University, CA (Kerr)
ROBERT ROSENZWEIG, President, Association of American Universities, DC (Kerr)
RONALD W. ROSKENS, President, University of Nebraska System (Petersen; Turney)
HENRY ROSOVSKY, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, MA (Kerr)
ROBERT G. ROSS, Chancellor, University of Arkansas at Little Rock (Corbally)
JAMES ROSSER, President, California State University, Los Angeles (Koltai)
SALVATORE G. ROTELLA, Chancellor, City Colleges of Chicago, IL (Gade)
JOHN E. ROUCHE, Professor, The University of Texas at Austin (de los Santos)
PRESTON ROYSTER, Rector, Virginia State University (Greenwood)
FREDERICK RUDOLPH, Professor of History, Williams College, MA (Fuller; Gade; Kerr)
LLOYD RUDOLPH, Professor, University of Chicago, IL (Corbally)
SUSANNE RUDOLPH, Professor, University of Chicago, IL (Corbally)
JANET RUYLE, Assistant Director, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)
JOHN W. RYAN, President, Indiana University (Kerr)
LOUIS E. SAAVEDRA, President, Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute, NM (de los Santos)
LEWIS S. SALTER, President, Wabash College, IN (Gade)
PETER SAMMARTINO, President, Fairleigh-Dickinson University, NJ (Kerr)
SYLVIA SAMMARTINO, spouse of Peter Sammartino (Kerr)
FREDERICK P. SAMPLE, President, Lebanon Valley College, PA (Kerr)
PATSY SAMPSON, President, Stephens College, MO (Gade; Riesman)
ROBERT T. SANDIN, Provost, Mercer University, GA; AGB Board Mentor (Gade)
GEORGE SANDISON, Chair, Search Committee, Western Washington University (Kerr)
TERRY SANFORD, President, Duke University, NC (Fretwell)
JOHN SAWYER, President, Williams College, MA (Kerr)
DAVID SAXON, President, University of California (Kerr)
JAMES RALPH SCALES, President, Wake Forest University, NC (Cuninggim)
HELEN SCHAEFER, spouse of President John Schaefer, Univesity of Arizona (Kerr)
ALEXANDER SCHILT, Chancellor, University of Houston, Downtown Campus, TX (Spearman)
RUTH SCHMIDT, President, Agnes Scott College, GA (Gade)
JAMES SCHOBEL, President, Mayville State College, ND (Gade)
JANE SCHOBEL, spouse of James Schobel (Gade)
BARRY G. SCHULER, President, North Idaho College (de los Santos)
HAROLD J. SCHULTZ, President, Bethel College, KS (Gade)
BUFORD SCOTT, Member, Board of Visitors, Virginia Commonwealth University (Greenwood)

GLORIA RANDLE SCOTT, Vice President, Clark College, GA (Kerr)
JULIUS S. SCOTT, JR., President, Paine College, GA (Brown)
ROBERT SCOTT, Governor, State of North Carolina (Petwell)
GLENN T. SEABORG, Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley (Kerr)
PAUL SEABURY, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley (Kerr)
GILMORE B. SEAVERS, President, Shippensburg State College, PA (Kerr)
PHILLIP B. SECOR, President, Cornell College, IA (Petersen)
FR. GERARD SENECAL, President, Benedictine College, KS (Gade)
FRANK A. SERRANO, President, Northern New Mexico Community College (de los Santos)
THADDEUS SEYMOUR, President, Rollins College, FL (Gade)
IRVING SHAIN, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin at Madison (Brown)
HAROLD T. SHAPIRO, President, University of Michigan Central Office (Brown)
PAUL SHARP, President, University of Oklahoma (Kerr)
ROSELLA SHARP, spouse of Paul Sharp (Kerr)
JOHN E. SHAY, President, Marygrove College, MI (Gade)
JOSEPH SHENKER, President, LaGuardia Community College of The City University of New York (Gade)
NEIL C. SHERBURNE, Regent, University of Minnesota; AGB Board of Directors (Brown)
ALEX SHERRIFFS, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, California State University (Kerr)
BETTY L. SIEGEL, President, Kennesaw College, GA (Greenwood)
JOEL SIEGEL, spouse of Betty L. Siegel (Greenwood)
JOHN SILBER, President, Boston University, MA (Kerr)
SAMUEL J. SILBERMAN, Trustee, Fairleigh-Dickinson University, NJ; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
PAM SILVER, spouse of Harold Silver, Principal, Bulmershe College of Higher Education, England (Gade)
PAUL SILVERMAN, President, University of Maine at Orono (Alden)
NANCY SILVERMAN, spouse of Paul Silverman (Alden)
ADELE SIMMONS, President, Hampshire College, MA (Miller)
JOHN SIMMONS, spouse of Adele Simmons (Brissette)
HERBERT A. SIMON, University Professor of Computer Sciences and Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon University, PA (Kerr)
EDWARD SIMONSEN, Community/Junior College Consultant, CA (Gade)
JOHN SINE, President, Charles County Community College, MD (Gade)
OTIS SINGLETARY, President, University of Kentucky (Brown)
GLORIA SINGLETARY, spouse of Otis Singletary (Brown)
ROBERT A. SKOTHEIM, President, Whitman College, WA (Fuller)
NADINE SKOTHEIM, spouse of Robert A. Skotheim (Fuller)
FRANK SMATHERS, JR., Trustee, University of Miami, FL; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)
DWIGHT M. SMITH, Chancellor, University of Denver, CO (Kerr)
GLENN P. SMITH, Chancellor, San Mateo Community College District, CA (Gade)
HARRY E. SMITH, President, Austin College, TX (Kerr)

ANNE SMITH, spouse of Harry E. Smith (Kerr)
HOKE L. SMITH, President, Towson State University, MD (Gade)
BARBARA E. FASSLER WALVOORD, spouse of Hoke L. Smith (Gade)
NORVEL SMITH, President, Merritt College, CA, (Kerr)
R. CURTIS SMITH, President, Mid-America Nazarene College, KS (Gade)
VIRGINIA SMITH, President, Vassar College, NY (Kerr)
MICHAEL I. SOVERN, President, Columbia University, NY (Kerr)
KEITH SPALDING, President, Franklin and Marshall College, PA (Fuller)
SAMUEL SPENCER, President, Davidson College, NC (Fuller)
IRVING J. SPITZBERG, JR., General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, DC (Kerr)
ROBERT A. SPIVEY, President, Randolph-Macon Women's College, VA (Greenwood)
STEPHEN SPURR, President, University of Texas at Austin (Kerr; Turney)
PATRICIA SPURR, spouse of Stephen Spurr (Kerr)
WILLIAM M. STAERKLE, President, Parkland Community College, IL (Corbally)
MARY LOU STAERKLE, spouse of William M. Staerkle (Corbally)
NEIL R. STAMP, Senior Counsel, Cornell University, NY (Kerr)
HENRY K. STANFORD, President, University of Miami, FL (Kerr)
RUTH STANFORD, spouse of Henry K. Stanford (Kerr)
S. FREDERICK STARR, President, Oberlin College, OH (Brown)
RONALD STEAD, Executive Director, Presidential Search and Assessment Service, DC (Kerr)
W. JACKSON STENGER, Trustee, Washington College, MD (Gade)
W. RICHARD STEPHENS, President, Greenville College, IL (Axelrod; Turney)
J. E. WALLACE STERLING, Chancellor, Stanford University, CA (Kerr)
THOMAS L. STEVENS, President, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, CA (Kerr)
BILL F. STEWART, President, Kirkwood Community College, IA (Gade)
JULIUS STRATTON, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kerr)
MERVIN K. STRICKLER, Consultant; AGB Board Mentor, DC (Gade)
JAMES STROBEL, President, Mississippi University for Women (Brown)
DONNA STROBEL, spouse of James Strobel (Brown)
MYRA H. STROBER, Director, Center for Research on Women, Stanford University, CA (Gade)
ROBERT H. STROTZ, President, Northwestern University, IL (Corbally)
MARGARET L. STROTZ, spouse of Robert Strotz (Corbally)
KALA STROUP, President, Murray State University, KY (Gade)
FR. WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN, President, Seattle University, WA (Kerr)
HERBERT SUSSMAN, President, Rio Hondo College, CA (Koltai)
JOSEPH T. SUTTON, Executive Director, Alabama Commission on Higher Education (Kerr)
DONALD SWAIN, President, University of Louisville, KY (Brown)
LAVINIA SWAIN, spouse of Donald Swain (Brown)

HOWARD R. SWEARER, President, Brown University, RI; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Alden)

ABEL B. SYKES, JR., President, Compton Community College, CA; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Kerr)

SYLVIA SYKES, spouse of Abel B. Sykes, Jr. (Kerr)

JAMES L. TALBOT, Acting President, Western Washington University (Kerr)

CONSTANCE TALBOT, spouse of James L. Talbot (Kerr)

RALPH M. TANNER, President, Baker University, KS (Gade)

GERRIT T. TENBRINK, President, McKendree College, IL (Gade)

GLENN TERRELL, President, Washington State University (Corbally)

JOANNE TERRY, Dean of Educational Services, Wayne County Community College, MI (Gade)

PAUL THOMPSON, President, Bellevue Community College, WA (Kerr)

ROBERT L. THOMPSON, Executive Vice President, Ketchum Inc., PA (Kerr)

E. E. THRASH, Executive Secretary and Director, Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, MS (Kerr)

ROBERT THREATT, President, Morris Brown College, GA (Kerr)

DALE TILLERY, Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)

JOHN S. TOLL, President, University of Maryland (Kerr)

DEBORAH ANN TAINTOR TOLL, spouse of John S. Toll (Kerr)

STEPHEN J. TRACHTENBERG, President, Univesity of Hartford, CT (Gade)

HORACE TRAYLOR, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Miami-Dade Community College, FL (Kerr)

CARL A. TRENDLER, Executive Coordinator, Council for Postsecondary Education, WA (Kerr)

ISRAEL TRIBBLE, Associate Vice Chancellor, State University System of Florida (Gade)

THOMAS TROTTER, General Secretary, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, The United Methodist Church, TN (Brown)

MARTIN TROW, Director, Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)

ALLAN TUCKER, Professor of Education, Florida State University (Gade)

BARBARA S. UEHLING, Chancellor, University of Missouri-Columbia; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Kerr)

FRANK E. VANDIVER, President, Texas A&M University (Munitz)

GORDON VAN WYLEN, President, Hope College, MI (Fuller)

GEORGE B. VAUGHAN, President, Piedmont Virginia Community College (Greenwood)

DONALD VEAL, President, University of Wyoming (Gade)

DAVID VIAR, Executive Director, California Community College Trustees Association (Gade)

JAMES F. VICKREY, JR., President, University of Montevallo, AL (Gade)

MARY VILLARD, Trustee, Vassar College, NY (Nason)

JOHN E. VISSER, President, Emporia State University, KS (Gade)

THOMAS G. VOSS, President, University of Charleston, WV; AGB Advisory Council of Presidents (Gade/Ingram)

JOAN WADLOW, Dean of Arts and Sciences, University of Wyoming (Kerr)

MARJORIE DOWNING WAGNER, President, Sonoma State College, CA (Kerr)

CHARLES U. WALKER, President, Linfield College, OR (Kerr)

CHERIE WALKER, spouse of Charles U. Walker (Kerr)

DONALD WALKER, Chancellor, University of Texas System (Munitz)

DONALD E. WALKER, President, Southeastern Massachusetts University (Kerr)

ANN LATHROP WALKER, spouse of Donald E. Walker (Kerr)

E. JEAN WALKER, Virginia Highland Community College (Greenwood)

FRANKLIN W. WALLIN, President, Earlham College, IN (Kerr)

NORMAN E. WATSON, Chancellor, Coast Community College District, CA (Kerr)

JAMES L. WATTENBARGER, Professor of Higher Education, University of Florida (Gade)

WILLIS WEATHERFORD, President, Berea College, KY (Fuller)

GEORGE WEATHERSBY, Commissioner for Higher Education, State of Indiana (Kerr)

ARNOLD WEBER, President, University of Colorado (Kerr)

JOHN WEFALD, Chancellor, State University System of Minnesota (Gade)

DONALD WEICHERT, President, College of the Redwoods, CA (Gade)

LYNN WEICHERT, spouse of Donald Weichert (Gade)

EDWARD WEIDNER, Chancellor, Univesity of Wisconsin at Green Bay (Gade)

RICHARD WEIGLE, President, St. John's College, MD and NM (Gade)

MARY WEIGLE, spouse of Richard Weigle (Gade)

ROLF WEIL, President, Roosevelt University, IL (Corbally)

LENI WEIL, spouse of Rolf Weil (Corbally)

STEPHEN WEINER, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, Mills College, CA (Gade/Kerr)

RUTH G. WEINTRAUB, Senior Vice President and Director of Special Programs, Academy for Educational Development, NY (Kerr)

MORTON WEIR, Vice President, University of Illinois (Corbally)

FR. ROBERT F. WEISS, President, Rockhurst College, MO (Gade)

KENNETH WELLER, President, Central University of Iowa (Petersen)

HERMAN B WELLS, President and University Chancellor, Indiana University (Kerr)

WILLIAM WENRICH, President, Santa Ana College, CA (Gade)

THOMAS E. WENZLAU, President, Ohio Wesleyan University (Gade)

BARBARA WESLEY, Trustee, Tacoma Community College, WA (Kerr)

NILS Y. WESSELL, President, Tufts University, MA; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)

MARIAN WESSELL, spouse of Nils Wessell (Kerr)

CAMERON P. WEST, President, Pfeiffer College, NC (Cuninggim)

DAN C. WEST, President, Arkansas College, AR (Riesman)

SIDNEY CHILDS WEST, spouse of Dan C. West (Riesman)

ANNE WEXLER, Consultant, DC; spouse of Joseph Duffy (Kerr)

JACQUELINE GRENNAN WEXLER, President, Webster College, MO (Kerr; Turney)

CLIFFORD WHARTON, Chancellor, State University of New York (Kerr)

MARY WALLACE WHEAT, Trustee, Foothill-DeAnza Community College District, CA; AGB Board of Directors (Gade)

JOHN W. WHITE, President, Nebraska Wesleyan University (Petersen)

LYNN WHITE, JR., President, Mills College, CA (Kerr)

JOHN C. WHITEHEAD, Trustee, Haverford College, PA (Nason)

MATTHEW J. WHITEHEAD, Trustee, Johnson C. Smith University, NC (Gade)

RICHARD F. WHITMORE, President, Kellogg Community College, MI (de los Santos)

JEROME WIESNER, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Alden)

LAYA WIESNER, spouse of Jerome Wiesner (Alden)

AARON B. WILDAVSKY, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley (Gade/Kerr)

W. CLYDE WILLIAMS, President, Miles College, AL (Gade)

ELAINE WILLIAMS, spouse of W. Clyde Williams (Gade)

DOUGLAS WILLIAMS, Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, Auburn University, AL (Gade)

LORRAINE WILLIAMS, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Howard University, DC (Kerr)

RONALD WILLIAMS, President, Northeastern Illinois University (Corbally; Gade)

ARLENE WILLIAMS, spouse of Ronald Williams (Corbally; Gade)

DAVID WILSON, Executive Assistant to the President, University of California (Gade)

EDWARD G. WILSON, Trustee, Earlham College, IN; AGB Board of Directors (Kerr)

HARRIET M. WILSON, Trustee, Tallahassee Community College, FL (Gade)

JOHN D. WILSON, President, Washington and Lee University, VA (Kerr)

LOGAN WILSON, President, American Council on Education, DC (Kerr)

O. MEREDITH WILSON, President, University of Minnesota (Kerr)

MARIAN WILSON, spouse of O. Meredith Wilson (Kerr)

HENRY R. WINKLER, President, University of Cincinnati, OH (Brown)

DAVID K. WINTER, President, Westmont College, CA (Gade)

JOHN WITTICH, President, MacMurray College, IL (Gade)

ROBERT WOLVERTON, President, Mount St. Joseph College, OH (Brown)

PEGGY WOLVERTON, spouse of Robert Wolverton (Brown)

PAUL WOODRING, Professor of Education, Western Washington University (Kerr)

ROGER WOODS, Associate for Higher Education, Presbyterian Church (USA), NY (Gade)

JEANETTE WRIGHT, President, Baypath Junior College, MA (Miller)

WILFRED D. WRIGHT, spouse of Jeanette Wright (Brissette)

STEVEN WRIGHT, President, Fisk University, TN (Kerr)

CORDELL WYNN, President, Stillman College, AL (Christian)

A. ZACHARY YAMBA, President, Essex County Community College, NJ (Gade)

CHARLES E. YOUNG, Chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles (Kerr)

H. EDWIN YOUNG, President, University of Wisconsin (Kerr)